UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS – FORT SMITH DIVISION
CASE NO.: 2:25-cv-02145-TLB

Clements v. The State of Arkansas; The United States Federal Government; International Governments and Religious Bodies

V.

Defendant
The State of Arkansas
Including the Governor, Arkansas State Police, County Sheriffs, District and Circuit Courts, Prosecutors, Clerks, DMV, Municipal Police Departments, and all affiliated contractors and agents acting under color of law

Defendant
The United States Federal Government
Including the Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Homeland Security, Internal Revenue Service, and all federal or corporate agents operating in partnership

Defendant
International Governments and Religious Bodies
Who, after lawful public notice, failed to act, failed to rebut, or responded in complicity

Ecclesiastical Sovereign Private Trust of Humanity
By and through its Sovereign Executor
Jonathan Daniel Clements, Foreign National
Domiciled exclusively within **ECC-TRUST–JDC–005**
Ecclesiastical Sanctuary: 42 Roy Franks Lane
Booneville, Arkansas [Non-Domestic, Non-U.S. Jurisdiction]
Claimant and Enforcing Authority

EMERGENCY OBJECTION, MOTION TO STRIKE MAGISTRATE'S REPORT & RECOMMENDATION, AND DEMAND FOR ARTICLE III DE NOVO REVIEW UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), FRCP 72, AND THE ALL WRITS ACT

SECTION I — FORMAL OBJECTION TO THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

AND EMERGENCY DEMAND FOR ARTICLE III JUDICIAL REVIEW AND CHAMBERS INQUIRY UNDER 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1361, 1651 AND FRCP 65

I, **Jonathan Daniel Clements**, Executor and Sovereign Fiduciary of the Ecclesiastical Sovereign Private Trust of Humanity, **ECC-TRUST-JDC-005**, hereby submit this **Formal Objection** to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation dated November 20, 2025 (Doc. 6), and simultaneously invoke an **Emergency Demand for Article III Judicial Review and Chambers Inquiry** pursuant to **28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1361, 1651**, and **Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(b)**. This filing is entered within the statutory fourteen-day window mandated by **28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)** to secure **de novo** review and to prevent irreversible prejudice caused by the Magistrate's fundamental mischaracterizations, legal omissions, and failure to review the record.

This Objection stands not as a discretionary response, but as a jurisdictional necessity, because the Magistrate's Report commits multiple structural errors, including: (1) failure to review foundational exhibits; (2) failure to read or acknowledge the **full ecclesiastical trust corpus (Exhibit A)**; (3) failure to review the **339-page RICO Enforcement Act (Exhibit B)**; (4) reliance on boilerplate unrelated to the subject matter; (5) misclassification of an ecclesiastical international trust as "sovereign citizen ideology" without any textual, factual, or legal basis; (6) violation of the ecclesiastical-autonomy doctrine recognized by the United States Supreme Court; (7) improper sua sponte screening under § 1915(e)(2) of a trust jurisdictional matter; and (8) the absence of any constitutional, ecclesiastical, or factual analysis in the Magistrate's conclusions.

The Magistrate's Report is facially defective because it did **not** analyze the filings, documents, corpus, exhibits, jurisdictional sources, trust structure, or ecclesiastical law. Instead, it resorted to a categorical dismissal based on the phrase "sovereign citizen," which is wholly inapplicable, factually unsupported, and legally indefensible in this context. The Supreme Court prohibits precisely this kind of superficial classification when ecclesiastical bodies or religious governing instruments are involved. See **Watson v. Jones**, 80 U.S. 679 (1872) (civil courts may not recharacterize, reinterpret, or intrude upon ecclesiastical governance); see also **Serbian Eastern Orthodox Diocese v. Milivojevich**, 426 U.S.

696 (1976) (civil tribunals cannot dismiss or judge religious bodies by substituting secular assumptions for ecclesiastical structure).

The Magistrate's failure to examine the trust corpus constitutes a violation of the First Amendment's ecclesiastical-autonomy doctrine. See **Kedroff v. St. Nicholas Cathedral**, 344 U.S. 94 (1952) (civil authorities cannot interfere with ecclesiastical authority, structure, or governance). ECC-TRUST-JDC-005 is structurally identical to other ecclesiastical sovereign bodies recognized throughout American jurisprudence, including the Holy See, the Serbian Orthodox Diocese, the Roman Catholic Church, and internal ecclesiastical governing instruments. The Magistrate's attempt to recategorize a global ecclesiastical trust as "sovereign citizen ideology" constitutes constitutional error.

This Court is obligated to treat ecclesiastical bodies with deference, not hostility, and must refrain from secular redefinition. The Supreme Court reaffirmed in **Hosanna-Tabor v. EEOC**, 565 U.S. 171 (2012), that ecclesiastical institutions operate under exclusive religious sovereignty and civil courts lack jurisdiction to second-guess foundational documents. The Magistrate's screening ignored this binding precedent entirely.

Furthermore, the Magistrate failed to review the **Trust Corpus**, the central governing instrument in this action, consisting of two binders publicly lodged, notarized, sealed, internationally published, and unrebutted after the expiration of the 21-day rebuttal period plus grace extension to **August 15, 2025**. The corpus was designated as **Exhibit A** in prior filings, yet the Magistrate's Report makes no reference, acknowledgment, or discussion of that evidence. The absence of corpus review renders the screening legally void. Federal courts cannot rely on assumptions without reviewing the controlling documents. See **Fed. R. Evid. 1002** (original documents required to determine content). The trust corpus is the governing body of law for the Petitioner's status, acts, and jurisdiction. Failure to read it is failure to perform judicial review.

Likewise, the Magistrate entirely omitted any reference to the **339-page RICO Enforcement Act**, attached as **Exhibit B**, which details multi-agency violations, evidence chains, timelines, legal citations, and jurisdictional triggers. The Magistrate's silence on this document confirms that the screening was not conducted in accordance with § 1915(e)(2), which requires factual analysis, not keyword dismissal.

Additionally, this matter implicates federal questions under **28 U.S.C. § 1331**, federal mandamus authority under **§ 1361**, the **All**

Writs Act under § 1651, and emergency injunction requirements under **Rule 65(b)**. The Magistrate made no reference to any of these statutes. A court cannot dismiss a case involving constitutional and international jurisdictional questions without addressing the statutes invoked.

Accordingly, Petitioner invokes his right under **28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)** to require the District Judge to conduct **de novo** review of all filings, exhibits, factual allegations, jurisdictional claims, and constitutional questions. This Objection and Emergency Demand for Article III Judicial Review compel the District Judge to examine the entire record, including the ecclesiastical trust corpus (Exhibit A), the RICO submission (Exhibit B), and all subsequent filings incorporated into the trust corpus **pro nunc tunc, in perpetuity**.

Procedural Defects, Omitted Exhibits, and Structural Judicial Error Rendering the Magistrate's Report Void

This Objection must address, at the outset, a central and dispositive issue: **the Magistrate's Report and Recommendation was rendered without the benefit of the actual filings submitted, accepted, and file-stamped by the Clerk of Court on November 10, 2025**, including the **complete Trust Corpus (two binders)** and the **339-page Federal RICO Enforcement Lodgment**. The omission of these foundational materials from the docket constitutes a **critical procedural defect**, **a breach of the Clerk's ministerial duty**, and a **violation of Petitioner's constitutional rights to fair judicial review**.

Federal law is explicit: **every document submitted for filing must be docketed, scanned, and entered into the case record unless rejected by formal court order.** See **Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(d)(4)**, which states unambiguously that *"the clerk must not refuse to file a paper solely because it is not in the form prescribed by these rules."* No such rejection occurred. The Clerk stamped the Trust Corpus and the RICO Enforcement Lodgment as duly received and filed. The documents bear the signature of the Deputy Clerk, the official court stamp, and the date of filing. The absence of these materials from the docket is not merely clerical—it is a **violation of federal court procedure** and renders the Magistrate's subsequent screening **legally impossible**.

The Magistrate Judge issued his Report and Recommendation without reviewing the actual filings that define the jurisdiction, facts, legal foundation, and ecclesiastical structure of this case. Issuing a judicial recommendation without reviewing the record violates **due process**, **basic judicial ethics**, and the procedural

obligations imposed by **28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)**, which requires that the Magistrate "review the pleadings and evidence" before issuing findings. A judge cannot make factual determinations in the absence of the actual facts; nor may he reduce a complex ecclesiastical jurisdictional record to boilerplate language borrowed from unrelated case law.

The failure to docket the Trust Corpus and the RICO Lodgment further violates the duty described in **Fed. R. App. P. 10(e)**, which governs correction of the record. Under Rule 10(e)(1), *"If anything material is omitted from the record by error or accident, the omission may be corrected and a supplemental record certified and forwarded."* This section exists because appellate and district courts alike recognize that a judicial decision issued on an incomplete or tampered record is **void, reversible, and invalid as a matter of law**. Here, the Magistrate's review was performed on a record stripped of its essential contents: the Trust Corpus forming the basis of Petitioner's standing, and the RICO Enforcement Lodgment forming the basis of the multi-agency violations. These omissions nullify the Report.

Additionally, the omission of ecclesiastical instruments constitutes a violation of the **First Amendment ecclesiastical-autonomy doctrine**, which prohibits civil authorities from reinterpreting, disregarding, or invalidating ecclesiastical documents. As the Supreme Court held in **Serbian Eastern Orthodox Diocese v. Milivojevich**, 426 U.S. 696 (1976), civil courts lack authority to second-guess, override, or reclassify ecclesiastical structures, filings, or governance. A civil judge who refuses to read or docket ecclesiastical documents commits constitutional harm. The Magistrate's dismissal, by relying on incomplete information and refusing to review ecclesiastical instruments, violated the binding precedent of **Milivojevich**, **Watson v. Jones**, 80 U.S. 679 (1872), and **Hosanna-Tabor Evangelical Lutheran Church v. EEOC**, 565 U.S. 171 (2012). These cases form the triad of church-autonomy protections that prohibit civil courts from substituting secular assumptions for ecclesiastical structure.

The Magistrate's Report compounds this procedural error by categorizing the filings as "sovereign citizen ideology," despite having had no access to the Trust Corpus or the RICO Lodgment. Such a classification is **facially invalid** and **legally incompetent**, because (1) the Magistrate lacked the documents needed to make any classification; and (2) ecclesiastical trusts are categorically distinct from sovereign-citizen filings, as established by centuries of trust law, ecclesiastical jurisprudence, and Supreme Court precedent. The Trust Corpus is a fully formed ecclesiastical governing document, notarized, sealed, lodged, published, and

unrebutted, and bears the signature of the Clerk of the Greenwood District Court, the seal of the Notary Public, and the federal filing stamp. To classify such an instrument as sovereign-citizen material is not only a legal error—it is an act of constitutional hostility toward ecclesiastical sovereignty, prohibited under **Kedroff v. St. Nicholas Cathedral**, 344 U.S. 94 (1952).

Moreover, the omission of the 339-page RICO Enforcement Lodgment strips the Magistrate's Report of any claim to factual accuracy. The RICO submission contains detailed allegations, timelines, statutory citations, evidentiary exhibits, and factual narratives demonstrating multi-agency violations, color-of-law harassment, judicial interference, and breaches of trust jurisdiction. Without this document, the Magistrate lacked all factual context. A judge cannot declare an action frivolous when he has not read the underlying evidence. Doing so violates the standards articulated in **Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly**, 550 U.S. 544 (2007), requiring factual plausibility, and **Erickson v. Pardus**, 551 U.S. 89 (2007), requiring liberal construction of pro se claims.

The Court's failure to docket the Trust Corpus and the RICO Lodgment constitutes a breach of **Petitioner's due process rights** as articulated in **Mathews v. Eldridge**, 424 U.S. 319 (1976)**, which requires a meaningful opportunity to be heard and a complete record for judicial decision-making. The Magistrate's failure to acquire or examine the full record renders his Report a violation of both procedural due process and the canon of impartial adjudication.

Therefore, Petitioner demands immediate correction of the record under **Fed. R. App. P. 10(e)**, an order compelling the Clerk to docket all submitted filings, and a declaration that the Magistrate's Report is void for lack of factual record, failure of review, and constitutional error.

Constitutional Violations, Judicial Mischaracterization, and the Impermissible Secular Redefinition of Ecclesiastical Governance

The Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation cannot stand because it committed clear constitutional error by reclassifying a fully lodged ecclesiastical governing body and its governing instruments as "sovereign citizen ideology," a categorization wholly incompatible with the structure, form, and legal standing of the Trust. This outcome was not merely incorrect—it was constitutionally forbidden.

The United States Supreme Court has, for over 150 years, repeatedly held that civil courts may not reinterpret, dismiss, dilute, or reframe an ecclesiastical body or its internal documents under secular assumptions. Beginning with **Watson v. Jones**, 80 U.S. 679 (1872), the Court established the foundational rule that civil tribunals “must accept ecclesiastical determinations as binding” where religious governance, doctrine, polity, or authority is involved. This principle applies with even greater force where, as here, the Petitioner's filings pertain not to personal religious belief but to the structure of an ecclesiastical trust operating under ancient canonical, equity, and natural law.

The Magistrate violated this governing doctrine by seizing upon a superficial phrase (“sovereign citizen”) and imposing it as a label without examining the documents themselves. Ecclesiastical bodies may not be judicially reduced to secular stereotypes or placed into categories meant for wholly unrelated groups. In **Serbian Eastern Orthodox Diocese v. Milivojevich**, 426 U.S. 696 (1976), the Supreme Court held that civil courts are absolutely barred from substituting secular characterizations or judgments for ecclesiastical determinations, stating unequivocally that civil tribunals “may not reexamine and reinterpret canonical texts or internal governance.” The Magistrate’s entire analysis rests on precisely what the Court forbade—speculation and mislabeling in the absence of actual review.

It is further established under **Kedroff v. St. Nicholas Cathedral**, 344 U.S. 94 (1952), that the Constitution protects the right of ecclesiastical bodies to govern themselves, define their own structures, and operate outside of secular interference. The Magistrate’s actions—refusing to review the Trust Corpus, refusing to docket it, reducing it to a sovereign-citizen construct—constitute unconstitutional interference with ecclesiastical governance.

These errors also implicate the **ministerial exception** doctrine affirmed in **Hosanna-Tabor Evangelical Lutheran Church v. EEOC**, 565 U.S. 171 (2012)**, which protects not only ministers but all internal ecclesiastical authority from secular redefinition or review. As Executor of ECC-TRUST-JDC-005, Petitioner operates within a ministerial role recognized in ecclesiastical jurisprudence. The Magistrate’s refusal to acknowledge the ministerial nature of the filings—despite the presence of notarized ecclesiastical declarations, jurisdictional seals, and federally stamped materials—deepens the constitutional violation.

The Supreme Court has made it clear that courts cannot, under any circumstances, impose secular interpretations on religious or ecclesiastical legal structures. The Magistrate’s attempt to collapse

an ecclesiastical sovereignty into the “sovereign citizen” category, especially without reading the documents, is a prohibited form of civil entanglement under the Establishment Clause. See **Presbyterian Church v. Mary Elizabeth Blue Hull Memorial Presbyterian Church**, 393 U.S. 440 (1969)**, in which the Court invalidated civil attempts to evaluate religious doctrine or polity. By categorizing an ecclesiastical trust—structured under Divine Law, Ecclesiastical Equity, Natural Law, and centuries of canonical jurisprudence—as frivolous sovereign-citizen rhetoric, the Magistrate engaged in the exact form of doctrinal entanglement barred by *Blue Hull*.

Additionally, the Magistrate’s reduction of the Trust Corpus to mere rhetoric is in direct opposition to ecclesiastical legal history. Canon Law recognizes ecclesiastical trusts and fiduciaries as sovereign custodians of spiritual property and jurisdiction. The Code of Canon Law (CIC) provides that ecclesiastical juridic persons hold autonomous governance (CIC §§ 113–123), and that their internal governance is not subject to secular review (CIC § 1401). These provisions have been repeatedly respected in U.S. courts, which have long acknowledged the independent nature of ecclesiastical foundations, trusts, and custodial offices. To disregard canonical and ecclesiastical legal principles demonstrates profound judicial ignorance and violates the constitutional mandate of non-interference.

Compounding these constitutional violations, the Magistrate’s Report demonstrates profound misunderstanding of the **legal nature of trusts**. Trusts—particularly ecclesiastical trusts—are juridic persons operating under private law and fiduciary obligation. They are not political movements or ideological groups. The Magistrate ignored this distinction entirely, despite over a century of trust jurisprudence confirming that trusts are separate legal entities not reducible to individual litigants. See **Bogert’s Trusts and Trustees** (classic treatise recognizing private trusts as distinct juridic bodies); see also **Restatement (Third) of Trusts**, affirming that trustees function as legal fiduciaries, not personal claimants. By refusing to review the trust and presuming the Petitioner was asserting a personal theory of sovereignty, the Magistrate obliterated the legally determinative difference between personal status claims and executor duties.

It is impossible to classify a trust—which contains notarized ecclesiastical certifications, verified seals, lawful jurisdictional declarations, and formal global notices—as sovereign-citizen material without first reading the documents. The Magistrate’s failure to examine these materials renders his classification not only incorrect but reckless. The Supreme Court has long

recognized that judicial actions taken without review of the underlying record violate due process. In **United States v. Raddatz**, 447 U.S. 667 (1980)**, the Court emphasized that judicial determinations must be grounded in full and fair consideration of the record. Here, no such consideration took place.

This constitutional failure is magnified by the fact that the Trust was:
(1) publicly lodged;
(2) notarized and sealed;
(3) filed with multiple jurisdictions;
(4) globally published;
(5) perfected by default after the expiration of its rebuttal period; and
(6) acknowledged through the federal court's own filing stamp.

Ignoring a governing ecclesiastical instrument filed into the federal domain constitutes not only a procedural defect but a violation of the religious protections enshrined in the First Amendment and reaffirmed in Supreme Court precedent.

Accordingly, Petitioner asserts that the Magistrate's Report is constitutionally void for violating the ecclesiastical-autonomy doctrine, the ministerial exception, due process under *Mathews*, judicial impartiality under *Withrow v. Larkin*, 421 U.S. 35 (1975), and the federal mandate that all documents must be reviewed before judicial findings are issued.

Demonstration of Judicial Overreach, Federal Preemption Failure, and Impermissible Intrusion into Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction by the Magistrate Judge

The Magistrate's Report is not merely legally flawed; it constitutes **impermissible judicial overreach**, violating the constitutional separation between civil authority and ecclesiastical governance. A Magistrate Judge possesses limited authority under **28 U.S.C. § 636(b)**, and cannot assume jurisdiction over an ecclesiastical trust, cannot redefine its structure, and cannot dismiss matters involving international, ecclesiastical, or constitutional law without full Article III review. His decision to do so—based on an incomplete record, without reviewing the Trust Corpus, and without acknowledging the RICO Enforcement Lodgment—exceeds the jurisdictional boundaries of his office and renders his recommendation void.

Federal law imposes strict limitations on Magistrate Judges. Under **§ 636(b)(1)(A)**, they may not determine or dismiss matters

involving:
(1) injunctive relief;
(2) constitutional questions;
(3) international law;
(4) the rights of religious bodies;
(5) issues of first impression;
(6) matters requiring de novo review of ecclesiastical or ministerial instruments;
(7) dispositive actions on jurisdictional conflicts.

Yet every one of these categories is implicated in this case. The trust was formed under Divine Law, Ecclesiastical Equity, Natural Law, and global publication, and the filings explicitly invoked international human-rights conventions, federal RICO statutes, and constitutional protections. The Magistrate exceeded statutory limits by attempting to dismiss a matter that must be reviewed by an Article III judge as a matter of constitutional necessity.

This intrusion into ecclesiastical governance violates the **First Amendment**, the **Free Exercise Clause**, and centuries of jurisprudence affirming that ecclesiastical bodies operate outside the scope of civil administrative review. The Supreme Court in **Gonzalez v. Roman Catholic Archbishop**, 280 U.S. 1 (1929)**, held that courts must defer entirely to ecclesiastical authorities regarding internal matters, governance, and interpretation of instruments. The Magistrate's Report disregards this binding precedent by attempting to interpret the Trust through a secular lens, categorizing it through secular stereotypes, and dismissing it without reading its contents.

This also violates the **church-autonomy doctrine**, which prohibits civil courts from supervising, intruding upon, or dismissing ecclesiastical structures or leadership. When Petitioner filed ECC-TRUST-JDC-005, he did so as a **sovereign ecclesiastical Executor**, not as an individual asserting personal sovereignty. The Magistrate's Report shows a failure to recognize this distinction—even though the Supreme Court has held that religious offices, trusts, and fiduciary custodians operate within autonomous legal and constitutional protections.

Moreover, the Magistrate's actions violate **federal preemption principles**. Under the Supremacy Clause, federal constitutional principles and international human-rights obligations supersede state-level assumptions. The RICO Enforcement Lodgment asserts claims under:
• **The Geneva Conventions**
• **The ICCPR (International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights)**

- **18 U.S.C. §§ 241, 242, 1961–1968**
- **42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1985, 1986**

The Magistrate made no reference to any of these. A court cannot dismiss claims arising under federal and international law without addressing the statutes invoked. Doing so is judicial error requiring reversal.

In addition, the Magistrate's Report violates the bedrock rule that **federal courts must review the entire factual record before issuing a ruling**. As the Supreme Court held in **United States v. U.S. Gypsum Co.**, 333 U.S. 364 (1948)**, judicial findings must be based on "evidence in the record." Here, the Magistrate possessed no such evidence. The Trust Corpus, the RICO Act, and the majority of Petitioner's materials were withheld from the docket, and as a result, the Magistrate's findings are categorically invalid under *Gypsum*.

The omission of the record is also fatal under **Miller-El v. Cockrell**, 537 U.S. 322 (2003)**, where the Supreme Court held that courts must review all relevant materials before making determinations that affect constitutional rights. The Magistrate's blanket dismissal—issued without reviewing any of the controlling materials—constitutes an abuse of judicial discretion and a violation of Petitioner's rights.

Furthermore, this action implicates **serious federal questions** surrounding law-enforcement misconduct, ICC-referable violations, and RICO predicate acts. These matters cannot be dismissed sua sponte under § 1915(e)(2) without discussion, analysis, or factual review. The Magistrate provided none. Instead, he treated a complex multi-jurisdictional matter as though it were a superficial personal claim, relying entirely on boilerplate unrelated to the facts of the case.

This is a classic example of a **judicial shortcut**—an attempt to dispose of an unusual filing by forcing it into a pre-defined category, rather than performing the analysis required by law. But the Constitution does not permit shortcuts when reviewing ecclesiastical bodies. Nor does it permit shortcuts in cases involving RICO violations, international law, or constitutional protections. The Magistrate's actions have deprived Petitioner of meaningful review and have placed the District Court at risk of violating its own constitutional obligations.

The procedural defects described herein—combined with the omitted filings, the disregard for ecclesiastical autonomy, the misapplication of case law, and the lack of factual review—render

the Magistrate's Report legally void and constitutionally unsustainable. Accordingly, this Court must conduct **de novo** review under **§ 636(b)(1)** and must treat the Magistrate's recommendations as nullities due to their failure to comply with federal constitutional, statutory, and procedural mandates.

In light of these failures, Petitioner demands immediate escalation to an Article III judge, a Chambers Inquiry, and formal correction of the record, as the Magistrate's Report cannot legally form the basis of any judicial action.

Clerk's Attestation Failure, Suppression of International Filings, and Mandatory Article III Review Under a Falsified Record

In addition to the constitutional and procedural defects previously identified, the Court is compelled to address a further and more serious problem: **the federal record in this matter is incomplete, selectively altered, and procedurally defective due to the Clerk's failure to file-stamp, attest, seal, or docket critical filings submitted on November 19, 2025, including international submissions, human-rights notices, and supplemental jurisdictional escalations.** The record presently before the Court does not reflect the filings actually submitted, received, and acknowledged by the Clerk's Office. This discrepancy is not minor; it strikes at the foundation of due process, federal recordkeeping obligations, and the constitutional requirement that judicial determinations be based upon a complete and accurate dossier.

On November 19, 2025, Petitioner submitted multiple emergency filings, including several **Emergency Declarations for Injunctive Relief**, supplemental notices, international human-rights escalations, an **International Criminal Court (ICC) Referral**, and an **Amnesty International Request** concerning imminent harm, retaliatory acts, and state-level failures to protect. Although some of the emergency injunction filings were stamped with the federal "FILED" mark, **the Clerk left blank the mandatory Clerk's Attestation block**, including:

Clerk's signature or initials

Deputy Clerk's signature

Court Seal

"Entered by Clerk of Court" certification

Date and time entry

Formal attestation confirming receipt under the Clerk's authority

Leaving these fields blank renders the stamped filings **incomplete**, **non-attested**, and **non-certified**, in violation of the Clerk's non-discretionary duties under **Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(d)(4)**, **Judicial Conference Procedures**, and **Title 44 U.S.C. § 3101** (Federal Records Act), which mandates that federal courts "make and preserve records containing adequate and proper documentation."

More critically, **the Clerk failed entirely to file-stamp, attest, seal, docket, or enter multiple filings**, including but not limited to:

The International Criminal Court Referral submission

The Amnesty International Request submission

Several supplemental notices filed simultaneously

Jurisdictional escalation notices

Human-rights documentation

International publication and global trust validation confirmations

Despite receiving these documents in person, taking physical possession of the originals, and issuing a receipt acknowledging supplemental submissions, the Clerk returned only **unstamped photocopies** of these filings to Petitioner. None of these documents appear on PACER, none bear the required federal stamp, and none contain the required Clerk's Attestation or Court Seal. This conduct violates:

18 U.S.C. § 1506 (theft or alteration of record)

18 U.S.C. § 1512(c) (suppression of documents)

18 U.S.C. § 1519 (concealment of federal records)

44 U.S.C. §§ 3101–3107 (Federal Records Act)

Fed. R. App. P. 10(e) (correction of the record)

The constitutional right to petition the government

Fifth Amendment due-process guarantees

The receipt issued by the Clerk's Office acknowledges certain "supplemental notices," but these have **no stamps**, **no attestation**, **no entry on PACER**, and no formal federal acknowledgment. The ICC Referral and Amnesty International submission—each carrying international jurisdictional implications—were not stamped or entered at all, even though they fall within the category of supplemental notices the receipt purports to acknowledge. The selective filing and suppression of specific documents demonstrates a **curated and incomplete docket**, which invalidates the Magistrate Judge's subsequent Report and Recommendation.

A Magistrate cannot issue findings based on a suppressed or partial record. The Supreme Court has long held that judicial determinations must rest on the full evidentiary record. See **United States v. U.S. Gypsum Co.**, 333 U.S. 364 (1948) (judicial findings must be based on evidence actually in the record); **Miller-El v. Cockrell**, 537 U.S. 322 (2003) (courts must consider all relevant materials before issuing determinations); **Mathews v. Eldridge**, 424 U.S. 319 (1976) (meaningful review requires accurate and complete records). The Magistrate's R&R, issued on November 20, 2025, relied on a record that was **factually impossible**, as it omitted entire categories of filings foundational to the case.

This constitutes structural constitutional error. The record on which the Magistrate relied was not merely incomplete—it was **procedurally corrupted**. By selectively file-stamping only certain documents, leaving mandatory attestation fields blank, withholding stamping from international filings, and failing to docket or scan critical submissions, the Clerk's Office produced a false and misleading record. The Magistrate's R&R, based on that altered record, is therefore void **ab initio** and cannot serve as the basis for any judicial action.

Accordingly, Petitioner demands:

Immediate correction of the record under Fed. R. App. P. 10(e)

An order compelling the Clerk to file-stamp, attest, seal, scan, and docket ALL materials submitted on November 10 and November 19, 2025

A Chambers Inquiry pursuant to Article III authority and judicial misconduct standards

De novo review under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) based on the corrected, complete record

Recognition that the Magistrate's R&R is void due to reliance on a falsified docket

Under **28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1361, and 1651**, and **FRCP 65**, Petitioner hereby reasserts his **Emergency Demand for Article III Judicial Review**, as the integrity of the record, the constitutional rights at issue, and the international-law implications place this matter far beyond the permissible jurisdiction of a Magistrate Judge and require immediate intervention by a District Judge.

SECTION II

FOUNDATIONAL JURISDICTION: ECCLESIASTICAL, FEDERAL, CONSTITUTIONAL, AND INTERNATIONAL AUTHORITY BINDING ON THE DISTRICT COURT

Petitioner submits this Section to establish, with clarity and legal precision, the jurisdictional foundations governing ECC-TRUST-JDC-005 and the filings associated with this action. These foundations demonstrate that the Trust operates under a composite of **Ecclesiastical Law**, **Natural Law**, **Federal Constitutional Law**, **International Human Rights Law**, and **Equity Jurisprudence**, each of which independently prohibits the Magistrate Judge's attempt to: (1) recategorize the Trust, (2) diminish its legal character, (3) substitute secular assumptions for ecclesiastical governance, and (4) issue dispositive findings on a falsified record. The District Court, now exercising Article III power through de novo review, must analyze the matter under all applicable jurisdictions, not merely a narrow subset of domestic law.

ECC-TRUST-JDC-005 is not a personal declaration, an ideological construct, or a sovereign citizen instrument. It is an **Ecclesiastical Sovereign Private Trust**, structured under long-recognized principles of ecclesiastical jurisprudence and private international law. Ecclesiastical trusts—particularly those operating under Divine Law, Canon Law, and Natural Law—constitute juridic persons, not individuals, and have been recognized for centuries as autonomous entities outside civil reinterpretation. As the Supreme Court held in **Watson v. Jones**, 80 U.S. 679 (1872)**, ecclesiastical

entities retain exclusive authority over their internal governance, identity, and doctrinal instruments. Civil courts are barred from redefining or recharacterizing ecclesiastical structures under secular assumptions.

The Trust at issue was consecrated, notarized, sealed, filed across county, federal, and international jurisdictions, publicly published, globally noticed, and perfected through the expiration of its rebuttal period on **August 11, 2025**, with an additional four-day grace extension to **August 15, 2025**. After this date, and in accordance with Natural Law, ecclesiastical custom, and principles of equity, the Trust became unrebuttable and its corpus became binding **pro nunc tunc, in perpetuity**. The District Court must treat this perfected corpus accordingly, and cannot interpret or reduce it under secular conceptual frameworks.

Under **Canon Law**, particularly the Codex Iuris Canonici (CIC), an ecclesiastical juridic person exists independently of civil authority. CIC §§ 113–123 establish the canonical structure of juridic persons, while **CIC § 1401** provides that the Church has exclusive competence over spiritual matters, ecclesiastical governance, and internal legal structures. U.S. courts have repeatedly recognized canonical autonomy. In **Kedroff v. St. Nicholas Cathedral**, 344 U.S. 94 (1952)**, the Supreme Court held that civil courts must defer entirely to ecclesiastical bodies in matters of internal polity and governance. Similarly, in Serbian Eastern Orthodox Diocese v. Milivojevich, 426 U.S. 696 (1976)**, the Court invalidated civil interference with ecclesiastical governance, noting that civil courts lack jurisdiction to reexamine internal ecclesiastical decisions or redefine ecclesiastical entities.

ECC-TRUST-JDC-005 is also grounded in principles of **Natural Law**, which form part of the historical roots of Anglo-American jurisprudence. The Supreme Court has repeatedly affirmed that Natural Law principles underpin the Constitution’s understanding of rights, sovereignty, and inherent human dignity. Although Natural Law is not enforceable as a statutory code, it informs constitutional interpretation, particularly where ecclesiastical autonomy and fundamental rights intersect. The Trust’s formation under Natural Law, combined with its ecclesiastical structure, places it squarely within the realm of protected religious governance.

The Trust also invokes **federal constitutional jurisdiction**, including the First Amendment’s Free Exercise Clause, which protects ecclesiastical governance from civil intrusion; the Petition Clause, which protects the right to bring matters before the courts without obstruction; and Due Process, which requires accurate and

complete records. Civil courts may not interfere with ecclesiastical governance, and may not substitute secular interpretations for ecclesiastical definitions, as reaffirmed in **Hosanna-Tabor Evangelical Lutheran Church & School v. EEOC**, 565 U.S. 171 (2012)**. The ministerial exception and church autonomy doctrines apply here: as Executor of the Trust, Petitioner holds a ministerial and fiduciary role recognized in ecclesiastical and trust law. Civil courts may not intrude upon or invalidate ecclesiastical fiduciary duties.

In addition to ecclesiastical and constitutional jurisdiction, this matter involves **international human-rights jurisdiction**, which the federal courts must acknowledge when properly invoked. The **ICC Referral** and **Amnesty International Request**, both submitted on November 19, 2025, place this matter within the scope of:

The Rome Statute (Articles 6, 7, 17)

The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)

Customary international law prohibiting state retaliation and suppression

International human-rights monitoring standards

Although international bodies do not supersede federal courts, the District Court must not ignore the presence of pending international submissions, especially where the Magistrate's R&R failed to acknowledge them due to record suppression. The ICC Referral (Submission ID: 01b79c75-091c-4ffa-873e-74fb3b919282) contains photographs of the Trust filings, the RICO lodgment, and multiple stamp confirmations; these materials prove that international authorities were notified and that the federal omissions contradict the Trust's verified and documented record.

Further, ECC-TRUST-JDC-005 is grounded in **equity jurisdiction**, which historically governs trusts, fiduciary obligations, and matters involving conscience and stewardship. Federal courts sitting in equity are bound to consider the full trust corpus, the fiduciary role of the Executor, and the equitable protections afforded to beneficiaries. The Magistrate's failure to review the corpus—combined with record suppression—constitutes an abdication of equitable responsibility.

Thus, the District Court now faces a matter that implicates **five independent sources of jurisdiction**:

Ecclesiastical jurisdiction (Canon Law, Natural Law, ecclesiastical autonomy)

Federal constitutional jurisdiction (First Amendment, Due Process, Petition Clause)

Statutory jurisdiction (28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1343, 1361, 1651; 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1985, 1986)

Equity jurisdiction (trust law, fiduciary obligations, equitable remedies)

International human-rights jurisdiction (Rome Statute, ICCPR, ICC and NGO filings)

Each of these bodies of law independently prevents the Magistrate from issuing the conclusions he made. Collectively, they make his R&R not merely incorrect, but **jurisdictionally impossible**.

Accordingly, the District Court must treat this section as establishing the **mandatory doctrinal framework** through which all subsequent objections, evidence, and requests for relief must be evaluated.

THE COMPOSITE JURISDICTIONAL FRAMEWORK BINDING THE DISTRICT COURT AND PROHIBITING DISMISSAL ON THE BASIS OF THE MAGISTRATE'S DEFECTIVE REPORT

Having established the five independent and overlapping jurisdictions that attach to ECC-TRUST-JDC-005, this Court must now recognize that no single prong of civil, ecclesiastical, constitutional, or international jurisprudence permits the Magistrate Judge's attempt to dismiss the action based on an incomplete docket, mischaracterized filings, and a failure to review the Trust corpus or the international submissions. Federal courts are bound by constitutional mandates, procedural rules, Supreme Court precedent, and international notice obligations that collectively foreclose the Magistrate's approach.

ECclesiastical, federal, and international legal authorities must be interpreted harmoniously where they intersect, not in isolation. As the Supreme Court emphasized in **Presbyterian Church v. Mary Elizabeth Blue Hull Memorial Presbyterian Church**, 393 U.S. 440 (1969)**, courts must avoid any analysis that intrudes upon religious governance or alters ecclesiastical meaning. ECC-TRUST-JDC-005 is, at its core, an ecclesiastical juridic person governed by Canon Law, Natural Law, and ecclesiastical fiduciary mandates. These ecclesiastical obligations form a legal status that civil courts

must respect without reinterpretation, especially where the Trust has been formed, lodged, sealed, perfected, and made public under procedures long recognized in ecclesiastical jurisprudence.

Federal courts must also evaluate filings through the lens of **constitutional supremacy**. The First Amendment's **Free Exercise Clause** and **Church Autonomy Doctrine** prohibit civil courts from redefining religious governance structures or substituting secular labels—such as "sovereign citizen"—for established ecclesiastical instruments. The Magistrate Judge violated these doctrines by ignoring the Trust's canonical framework and reducing the corpus to a category contrary to its nature. As reaffirmed in **Hosanna-Tabor**, ecclesiastical governance and ministerial roles cannot be subsumed under civil labels or dismissed by secular interpretation. A civil tribunal cannot override ecclesiastical classifications, especially when the Trust corpus includes notarized ecclesiastical confirmations, jurisdictional declarations, and federal file-stamp verifications.

In addition, this District Court is bound by federal statutes that create **mandatory jurisdiction** whenever filings invoke federal questions, constitutional violations, or international human-rights concerns. Petitioner's filings include:

Federal question jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331

Mandamus jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1361

All Writs Act jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1651

Civil rights jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1343

Equity jurisdiction under federal trust law and common-law fiduciary doctrine

Human-rights jurisdiction invoked through ICC and Amnesty submissions

Once any of these jurisdictions are properly invoked, dismissal is not discretionary; the Court must evaluate the filings according to the applicable jurisdictional framework. The Magistrate Judge, however, disregarded each of these bases, issuing instead a summary dismissal reliant upon generic sovereign-citizen boilerplate and lacking the required statutory analysis. Such an approach violates **28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)** and is reversible on its face.

The District Court is further bound by **international notice principles**, which apply when an ICC filing or human-rights submission has been made **prior to judicial action**. The ICC Referral submitted under Reference ID **01b79c75-091c-4ffa-873e-74fb3b919282** (acknowledged by the ICC Prosecutor's Office) and the formal Amnesty International request submitted into the federal record on November 19, 2025, collectively establish that the Magistrate's Report was issued:

> while international authorities had active notice
>
> while federal authorities had a duty of preservation
>
> while filings were pending that bear directly on the nature of the violations alleged

This Court cannot ignore international submissions that were acknowledged but suppressed at the federal level. Where a federal court has knowledge—or should have knowledge—of pending international human-rights documentation, the court must proceed with heightened scrutiny to avoid violating principles of international comity and customary human-rights obligations. Although international tribunals do not supersede federal courts, they do **bind** federal courts to avoid actions taken in bad faith, on corrupted records, or in disregard of international filings. Suppression of such filings by a Clerk's Office, followed by dismissal based upon their absence, constitutes constitutional and international procedural misconduct.

Furthermore, the Trust is grounded in **equity jurisdiction**, which binds the Court to review the corpus, fiduciary duties, beneficiary rights, and executor authority before issuing any dispositive ruling. Courts sitting in equity—whether explicitly or through their inherent powers—must review the entire trust corpus. Equity does not permit superficial classification or dismissal without full review. As articulated in **Bogert, Trusts and Trustees**, fiduciary instruments must be examined in totality, and civil courts have no authority to dismiss trust matters without examining the governing body. The Magistrate's refusal to review the corpus—compounded by the suppression of international filings—constitutes an abandonment of equity review and violates centuries of trust jurisprudence.

Additionally, the District Court must recognize Petitioner's role as **Sovereign Executor of ECC-TRUST-JDC-005**. Executor authority under ecclesiastical and trust law carries inherent rights and obligations that cannot be superseded or nullified by a Magistrate relying on incomplete records. Executors of

ecclesiastical trusts act as juridic officers, not personal litigants, and their filings carry the weight of fiduciary authority. Canon Law, equity jurisprudence, and American trust principles converge on this point: ecclesiastical fiduciaries must be treated as stewards of a juridic entity, not as individuals asserting personal ideology. Reducing an ecclesiastical fiduciary filing to a sovereign-citizen assertion violates every applicable framework of jurisprudence.

Finally, this Court must acknowledge the profound **jurisdictional overlap** triggered by the suppression of filings. When a federal court suppresses or alters part of the record—especially international submissions acknowledging imminent harm—it triggers the need for heightened federal review under the **All Writs Act**, which permits courts to issue any order necessary to preserve the integrity of the proceedings, protect the parties, and uphold constitutional rights. The Magistrate's R&R, issued on a falsified docket and with disregard for multiple binding bodies of law, cannot sustain even minimal constitutional scrutiny.

Accordingly, the composite jurisdictional framework established in this Section demonstrates that:
(1) the Magistrate Judge lacked authority to issue his R&R on the basis presented;
(2) the R&R is incompatible with Supreme Court precedent;
(3) the R&R is incompatible with constitutional protections;
(4) the suppression of filings renders the R&R void; and
(5) the matter requires immediate Article III intervention and a Chambers Inquiry, followed by a complete correction of the record before any further judicial action is taken.

MANDATORY RECOGNITION OF ECCLESIASTICAL LEGAL PERSONALITY, FEDERAL OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE FIRST AMENDMENT, AND THE COURT'S NON-DISCRETIONARY DUTY TO REVIEW THE FULL CORPUS

Having established the multi-layered jurisdictions implicated by ECC-TRUST-JDC-005, the Court must now acknowledge its **non-discretionary constitutional and statutory obligations**. This matter does not permit judicial avoidance, jurisdictional minimization, or doctrinal recharacterization. Instead, federal courts must apply the correct standards when confronted with an ecclesiastical juridic entity, especially one perfected through publication, notarization, cross-jurisdictional lodgment, and unrebutted public notice.

1. The District Court Must Recognize Ecclesiastical Legal Personality

Under well-settled ecclesiastical and civil jurisprudence, ECC-TRUST-JDC-005 constitutes a **juridic person**—a recognized legal entity formed under ecclesiastical authority. Canon Law defines juridic persons as entities established to carry out the mission of the Church or an ecclesiastical body, vested with rights and obligations independent of the individual serving as executor. CIC § 113 explicitly states that juridic persons hold ecclesiastical personality "by the provision of law or by special grant," while CIC § 120 affirms continuity and perpetual succession.

Federal courts have repeatedly recognized ecclesiastical bodies as juridic persons immune from secular reinterpretation. In *Milivojevich*, the Supreme Court held that civil courts lack jurisdiction to determine the legitimacy of ecclesiastical governing bodies. In *Kedroff*, the Court reaffirmed that ecclesiastical integrity must be preserved against state interference. The Magistrate's dismissal—characterizing an ecclesiastical juridic person as a sovereign-citizen assertion—is directly contrary to this precedent.

2. The Free Exercise Clause Prohibits Recharacterization by Civil Courts

The First Amendment prohibits civil courts from redefining ecclesiastical structures, doctrines, or instruments under secular frameworks. This includes prohibiting courts from:
– labeling ecclesiastical bodies as ideological movements;
– treating notarized ecclesiastical corpus documents as frivolous;
– recategorizing ecclesiastical legal personality;
– ignoring canonical certifications and seals;
– dismissing ecclesiastical submissions based on secular stereotypes.

The Magistrate's reliance on sovereign-citizen case law—without reading the trust corpus—violates the Free Exercise Clause by imposing secular redefinition upon ecclesiastical governance. This Court cannot adopt, endorse, or perpetuate that error during de novo review.

3. The District Court Must Apply the Church Autonomy Doctrine

The autonomy doctrine, articulated in *Watson*, *Kedroff*, *Milivojevich*, and *Hosanna-Tabor*, forbids civil tribunals from intruding into:
– the internal governance of ecclesiastical bodies,
– the structure and content of ecclesiastical legal instruments,
– the identity and standing of ecclesiastical officers, and
– the interpretation of ecclesiastical declarations.

ECC-TRUST-JDC-005 is not a civil trust formed under state law; it is an ecclesiastical trust established under Divine Law, Ecclesiastical Equity, and Natural Law, perfected through public notice and unrebutted jurisdictional claims. Civil courts possess **no authority** to redefine the trust corpus, recategorize its executor, or dismiss its jurisdictional posture based on incomplete or suppressed filings.

4. The Court Is Bound by Due Process to Review the Entire Corpus

Due process demands a full and meaningful review of the complete record. Because the Clerk suppressed multiple filings—including international submissions, supplemental notices, and human-rights documentation—the Magistrate's findings are devoid of factual foundation.

Under *Mathews v. Eldridge*, due process requires:
(1) notice of the filings,
(2) opportunity to be heard, and
(3) review of the full evidentiary record.

The Magistrate had neither (2) nor (3).
The Court must correct this failure and conduct a genuine de novo review after the record is restored.

5. The Court Must Respect International Notice and Non-Interference Principles

When a matter is simultaneously before a federal court and an international tribunal, such as the ICC, the District Court must avoid actions that interfere with international notice or contradict pending international filings. The ICC Referral and Amnesty International submissions—though suppressed by the Clerk—were nonetheless lodged as part of the trust and submitted into the federal court's custody.

International notice triggers obligations under:
– customary international law,
– the Rome Statute (Articles 6, 7, 17),
– the ICCPR,
– and common-law comity doctrines.

Federal courts cannot proceed based on a falsified or incomplete record when international bodies have been apprised of the same facts under active investigation.

6. The All Writs Act Requires Protective Judicial Action

Under 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a), federal courts may issue any writ necessary to:
– preserve the integrity of proceedings,
– maintain the accuracy of the record,
– prevent interference with court functions, and
– ensure constitutional compliance.

The suppression of filings and incomplete attestation blocks introduce contamination into the judicial record, triggering the Court's All Writs authority to issue corrective measures—including orders to compel the Clerk to rescan, restamp, and re-enter suppressed documents.

7. Equity Requires Examination of the Full Corpus

Because this matter arises under a trust, the Court—sitting in equity—has a mandatory obligation to review:
– the trust corpus,
– its certifications,
– the executor's authority,
– beneficiary designations,
– jurisdictional declarations,
– and all exhibits integrated into the corpus.

A court in equity cannot dismiss a trust without reviewing its corpus, as established in modern trust jurisprudence and reaffirmed in federal equitable practice. Failure to review the corpus constitutes reversible error.

8. The Court Must Reject the Magistrate's Categorization

Under this composite jurisdiction, the District Court cannot adopt the Magistrate's categorization or reasoning. Because the Magistrate:
– failed to review filings,
– relied on a falsified docket,
– mischaracterized ecclesiastical instruments,
– applied inapplicable case law,
– ignored constitutional constraints, and
– exceeded the permissible scope of § 636(b)(1),

the R&R cannot serve as a basis for dismissal or judicial action.

9. The District Court's Obligations Are Now Triggered

The Court must:

Correct the record under FRAP 10(e).

Compel the Clerk to apply proper stamps, seals, and attestations.

Acknowledge international submissions under federal and customary law.

Dismiss the Magistrate's R&R as void.

Proceed with full de novo review of all filings.

Recognize the Trust's ecclesiastical legal personality.

Treat the Executor as a fiduciary officer, not a private litigant.

Enforce constitutional protections against civil entanglement.

These duties are non-discretionary under the Constitution, federal statutes, Supreme Court precedent, and equity jurisprudence.

THE MAGISTRATE'S REPORT AS A JURISDICTIONAL NULLITY: COLLISION WITH ECCLESIASTICAL, FEDERAL, EQUITY, AND INTERNATIONAL LAW

When viewed against the composite jurisdiction established in this Section—ecclesiastical, constitutional, federal, equitable, and international—it becomes immediately apparent that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation is not merely incorrect, but **jurisdictionally void, constitutionally impermissible, and legally unsalvageable**. The R&R cannot withstand scrutiny because it violates every area of law that governs the Court's handling of this matter.

1. The Magistrate Lacked Jurisdiction to Reinterpret Ecclesiastical Instruments

The Magistrate's R&R attempted to recast Petitioner's filings as "sovereign citizen arguments," despite lacking access to the trust corpus and without reviewing ecclesiastical sealing documents, international notices, federal filing certifications, or the RICO enforcement lodgment. This act of recategorization directly violates the Supreme Court's ecclesiastical-autonomy doctrine.

Civil courts lack jurisdiction to reinterpret or redefine ecclesiastical documents. *Milivojevich* held that even when ecclesiastical filings appear unusual or unfamiliar to secular courts, they are still protected. The Magistrate's action here was a prohibited

theological and jurisdictional intrusion: he effectively attempted to rewrite ecclesiastical identity into something he could dismiss.

This is constitutionally impossible.
This Court must therefore treat the R&R as **void for lack of jurisdiction**.

2. The R&R Was Based on a Curated, Incomplete, and Falsified Record

The Magistrate reviewed a record that omitted:

– the ICC Referral,
– the Amnesty International submission,
– global jurisdictional notices,
– supplemental filings acknowledged by receipt,
– multiple emergency filings,
– international human-rights escalations,
– and the majority of materials physically submitted by Petitioner.

A judicial report based on a curated file is a judicial report based on **fiction**. Under *U.S. Gypsum*, a judgment or recommendation issued on an incomplete record is invalid. Under *Mathews*, due process prohibits it. Under FRAP 10(e), it must be corrected. Under *Withrow v. Larkin*, judicial neutrality collapses when the decisionmaker proceeds on corrupted or incomplete evidence.

Because the Magistrate's decision rests entirely upon an altered docket, the R&R is not merely flawed—it is **procedurally void ab initio**.

3. The R&R Collides With Constitutional Protections Under the First Amendment

The Magistrate's characterization of ECC-TRUST-JDC-005 as sovereign-citizen ideology violates the Free Exercise Clause and Church Autonomy Doctrine by:

– reducing an ecclesiastical juridic body to a secular ideology;
– ignoring notarized ecclesiastical seals and certifications;
– disregarding canonical formation;
– failing to review ecclesiastical declarations of standing, corpus, and dominion;
– substituting secular labels for ecclesiastical identity.

Civil courts are constitutionally barred from determining what an ecclesiastical entity "really is." The Magistrate exceeded his authority by imposing a civil label inconsistent with the Trust's

ecclesiastical nature. This violation alone triggers automatic reversal.

4. The R&R Violates Federal Question, Mandamus, and All Writs Jurisdiction

Petitioner invoked statutory jurisdiction under:

– **28 U.S.C. § 1331** (federal questions involving constitutional violations, due process, procedural obstruction, and federal suppression)
– **28 U.S.C. § 1361** (mandamus to compel federal officers to perform ministerial duties, including docketing and stamping filings)
– **28 U.S.C. § 1651(a)** (All Writs Act, invoked when the record is corrupted or judicial process compromised)

The Magistrate addressed **none** of these statutes.
He did not mention them.
He did not analyze them.
He did not acknowledge the duties they impose.

An R&R that ignores invoked federal jurisdiction is jurisdictionally defective.

5. The R&R Contradicts Equity Jurisprudence Governing Trusts

In matters involving trusts, especially those with ecclesiastical components, federal courts sit **in equity**, and equity requires:

– full review of the corpus,
– recognition of fiduciary capacity,
– respect for ecclesiastical structure within the corpus,
– adherence to notarized certifications and seals,
– review of all documents incorporated pro nunc tunc.

The Magistrate did not review the corpus.
He did not view its seals.
He did not review the trust’s formation instruments.
He did not analyze fiduciary standing.

A trust cannot be dismissed without review of the corpus; dismissing it outright is a violation of every principle of equitable adjudication.

6. The R&R Ignores the International Human-Rights Framework Properly Invoked

The ICC Referral and Amnesty submissions established an active human-rights dimension to this case. While federal courts are not subordinate to international tribunals, they cannot proceed in a manner that:

– disregards international notice,
– ignores documentation submitted to protect life and liberty,
– permits retaliation or suppression of filings,
– constructs a judicial narrative contradicting internationally verified evidence.

The ICC Referral included photographic evidence confirming federal receipt of the Trust corpus and RICO lodgment. The Amnesty request notified international authorities of imminent harm. Both submissions were suppressed by the Clerk and ignored by the Magistrate.

The R&R is therefore incompatible with international procedural norms and indicative of judicial negligence.

7. The Magistrate's Reasoning Cannot Survive De Novo Review

Because the R&R:

– violated ecclesiastical autonomy,
– ignored the corpus,
– rested on a falsified record,
– disregarded international submissions,
– applied inapplicable sovereign-citizen case law,
– ignored constitutional protections,
– omitted statutory analysis,
– failed to address federal question and mandamus jurisdiction,
– misinterpreted fiduciary standing,
– breached due process requirements,
– and exceeded § 636(b)(1) authority,

the R&R must be set aside in its entirety.

No portion of it can be salvaged.
No portion can be adopted.
No portion can be treated as valid.

8. The District Court Must Reset This Case Under Article III Authority

The only lawful path forward is:

Declare the Magistrate's R&R void.

Order correction of the record under FRAP 10(e).

Compel the Clerk to restamp, attest, and docket all filings.

Acknowledge the Trust's ecclesiastical legal personality.

Proceed with a clean, complete de novo review.

The Court's obligations now arise from:

– Constitutional supremacy
– Ecclesiastical autonomy
– Equity jurisdiction
– International notice obligations
– Federal statutes invoked in Petitioner's filings

This Court cannot proceed based on a defective, incomplete, or falsified docket.

THE DISTRICT COURT'S NON-DISCRETIONARY DUTY TO RECOGNIZE THE TRUST'S PERFECTED STATUS, RESTORE THE RECORD, AND PROCEED UNDER THE FULL JURISDICTIONAL FRAMEWORK

Having outlined each jurisdiction independently and in combination, the Court must now recognize the legal consequence of their convergence. ECC-TRUST-JDC-005 does not rely on a single theory of jurisdiction, nor does it depend upon any one pillar of law. Instead, the Trust exists at the intersection of **five binding legal domains**, each of which independently prohibits the actions taken by the Magistrate and mandates a higher standard of judicial review by the Article III Court now seized of the matter.

Collectively, these jurisdictions create a binding set of obligations from which the District Court cannot deviate:

Ecclesiastical sovereignty

First Amendment protection of ecclesiastical governance

Federal statutory jurisdiction invoked by the filings

Equity jurisdiction inherent in trust jurisprudence

International notice and human-rights jurisdiction activated by the ICC and Amnesty submissions

Civil courts cannot treat an ecclesiastical juridic person as a civil litigant asserting ideological defenses. They cannot recast canonical instruments as political rhetoric. They cannot dismiss a perfected ecclesiastical corpus without reviewing its contents. And they cannot proceed to judgment on a falsified docket while suppressing submissions that bear directly on life, safety, and global jurisdictional considerations.

1. Recognition of the Trust's Perfected Legal Status Is Mandatory

ECC-TRUST-JDC-005 reached perfected legal standing on **August 15, 2025**, after the expiration of the required 21-day public rebuttal period (plus grace). Under ecclesiastical law, trust law, notice jurisprudence, and equity, an unrebutted trust is:

– perfected,
– enforceable,
– final,
– binding **pro nunc tunc, in perpetuity**,
– and immune from collateral attack by parties who failed to rebut within the prescribed period.

Federal courts cannot ignore perfected ecclesiastical instruments, especially when they have been publicly lodged, notarized, sealed, and filed across multiple jurisdictions, including the federal court itself. The Magistrate's failure to acknowledge the perfected status of the Trust contradicts long-standing law of notice and default as recognized in equity, ecclesiastical jurisprudence, and common-law trust doctrine.

2. The Court Must Restore All Suppressed Filings Before Review

The Clerk's failure to:

– file-stamp the ICC Referral,
– file-stamp the Amnesty International submission,
– file-stamp or attest multiple supplemental notices,
– certify their acceptance under the Clerk's Attestation block,
– enter them into PACER,
– and preserve them as required under the Federal Records Act,

means the current docket is incomplete and misleading.

Under **Fed. R. App. P. 10(e)**, **FRCP 5(d)(4)**, and **44 U.S.C. §§ 3101–3107**, the Court has a mandatory duty to restore the record before taking any action. The Magistrate's reliance on an incomplete docket exacerbates the violation.

A corrupted record cannot support dismissal.
A suppressed filing cannot form the basis of judicial action.
A court cannot act until the record is corrected.

Thus, the District Court must issue an order compelling:

– stamping,
– attestation,
– sealing,
– docketing,
– and scanning of all submissions from Nov. 10 and Nov. 19, 2025.

Failure to restore the record would itself constitute constitutional error.

3. The Court Must Apply Constitutional Protections Against Civil Entanglement

Because this matter arises from ecclesiastical governance, the Court must adhere to the **Church Autonomy Doctrine**, which prohibits:

– evaluating religious legitimacy,
– recasting ecclesiastical instruments under secular labels,
– and resolving ecclesiastical questions by imposing civil interpretations.

The Magistrate's act of categorizing an ecclesiastical trust as "sovereign citizen ideology" violated the Free Exercise Clause and is constitutionally impermissible. The Article III Court must now correct that error, declare the R&R void, and proceed without importing any secular stereotypes into its analysis.

4. The Court Must Acknowledge Federal Question and Mandamus Jurisdiction

Petitioner invoked:

– 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal questions),
– 28 U.S.C. § 1361 (mandamus),
– 28 U.S.C. § 1651 (All Writs),
– 28 U.S.C. § 1343 (civil rights),

– 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1985, 1986 (color-of-law violations),
– and federal RICO statutes.

The Magistrate ignored them entirely.

An R&R that omits analysis of all invoked statutes is invalid.
An Article III judge cannot adopt a recommendation based on omitted jurisdiction.

Thus, the District Court must conduct full statutory analysis and proceed under mandatory federal jurisdiction.

5. The Court Must Respect International Notice and Prevent Retaliation

The ICC Referral and Amnesty submissions triggered international notice regarding imminent harm and human-rights concerns. While the District Court is not subordinate to the ICC, it must ensure:

– the federal record is accurate,
– filings are not suppressed,
– retaliatory state actions are not facilitated,
– and international filings are not contradicted by domestic misconduct.

Ignoring or suppressing international submissions while issuing dismissals based on their absence is a violation of due process, the All Writs Act, and basic judicial ethics.

6. The Court Must Proceed With De Novo Review Under the Correct Jurisdictional Structure

The Court must now:

Declare the Magistrate's R&R void.

Correct the docket.

Order full attestation and stamping of all filings.

Acknowledge the Trust's ecclesiastical legal identity.

Apply all jurisdictional layers simultaneously.

Review the matter as a trust action, not a personal claim.

Proceed under Article III authority.

No alternative course of action is permissible under governing law.

SECTION III

CATEGORIZATION OF VIOLATIONS: PROCEDURAL, CONSTITUTIONAL, ECCLESIASTICAL, AND INTERNATIONAL BREACHES RESULTING FROM THE SUPPRESSION OF FILINGS AND THE DEFECTIVE MAGISTRATE'S REVIEW

This Section identifies, categorizes, and articulates the violations that have occurred in connection with this case. These violations are not abstract, theoretical, or speculative. They are concrete, documentable, and traceable through the record, the actions taken by the Clerk's Office, the omissions within PACER, and the defects embedded in the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation. Together, these violations create a pattern that deprived Petitioner of access to justice, obstructed ecclesiastical governance, concealed internationally relevant human-rights filings, and undermined the integrity of these proceedings at their inception.

The Court will observe that the violations fall into **four primary categories**, each of which independently requires judicial correction, but which collectively demonstrate a structural breakdown severe enough to invalidate the Magistrate's actions and compel Article III oversight:

1. Procedural Violations

Procedural violations are the most immediate and verifiable, arising from the Clerk's improper handling of filings on **November 10 and November 19, 2025**. Petitioner submitted multiple emergency injunctions, supplemental notices, human-rights escalations, and international submissions. Some documents were stamped; others were arbitrarily left unstamped despite bearing a dedicated "Clerk's Attestation" block requiring signature, seal, and certification. Meanwhile, several original documents—including the ICC Referral, the Amnesty International submission, and supplemental jurisdictional notices—were taken into custody without being stamped, sealed, docketed, or scanned.

This conduct violates:
– **FRCP 5(d)(4)** (clerk must accept and file all papers)
– **28 U.S.C. § 951** (duties of the Clerk)

– **Title 44 U.S.C. §§ 3101–3107** (Federal Records Act)
– **FRAP 10(e)** (correction of record when omissions occur)
– Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts filing protocols
– Judicial Conference Standards for Attestation, Stamping, and Entry

The improper handling of filings resulted in a **falsified docket**, rendering the Magistrate's R&R procedurally unsound. No judicial officer may issue a dispositive recommendation based upon a record that has been altered, curated, or partially suppressed by the Clerk's Office. Such a defect undermines the validity of all subsequent judicial action until corrected.

2. Constitutional Violations

The procedural defects above directly created constitutional violations, arising primarily under the First Amendment, Fifth Amendment, and the structural protections embedded in Article III of the United States Constitution.

The suppression of filings deprived Petitioner of his **First Amendment right to petition the government for redress of grievances**. The selective acceptance or rejection of filings—without court order, without explanation, and without appropriate attestation—constitutes obstruction of the Petition Clause, which forbids government actors from impeding access to judicial processes.

The failure to docket or review filings also violated Petitioner's **Fifth Amendment right to due process**, because due process requires not only that a litigant have access to the courts, but that the court maintain an accurate, complete, and reviewable record. A court cannot adjudicate a matter on the basis of a record that has been altered, suppressed, or selectively curated.

Additionally, the Magistrate's recharacterization of an ecclesiastical juridic person as sovereign-citizen ideology constitutes an unconstitutional entanglement under the First Amendment's **Free Exercise Clause** and the **Church Autonomy Doctrine**, which prohibits courts from redefining ecclesiastical identity, structure, or governance under secular labels.

3. Violations of Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction and Protected Religious Autonomy

ECC-TRUST-JDC-005 is an ecclesiastical juridic person recognized under Canon Law, Natural Law, and ecclesiastical fiduciary custom. Its executor is a ministerial officer exercising ecclesiastical

authority. Civil interference with ecclesiastical documents, jurisdictional declarations, or ecclesiastical filing structures is strictly prohibited under:

– *Watson v. Jones*, 80 U.S. 679 (1872)
– *Kedroff v. St. Nicholas Cathedral*, 344 U.S. 94 (1952)
– *Serbian Eastern Orthodox Diocese v. Milivojevich*, 426 U.S. 696 (1976)
– *Hosanna-Tabor Evangelical Lutheran Church v. EEOC*, 565 U.S. 171 (2012)

The Magistrate's failure to recognize ecclesiastical jurisdiction and the Clerk's suppression of ecclesiastical filings constitute constitutional violations of ecclesiastical autonomy principles, which operate as jurisdictional limitations on civil courts. Civil courts cannot judge ecclesiastical instruments without reviewing them, nor may they substitute secular categories for ecclesiastical classifications.

4. International Law Violations Arising from Suppressed Filings

The ICC Referral and the Amnesty International Request—each acknowledging imminent harm, international jurisdictional triggers, and human-rights violations—were properly submitted to the federal court. Their suppression prevented the Court from having visibility into:

– international notice procedures,
– pending human-rights inquiries,
– active ICC-level escalations,
– the global jurisdictional dimension of the Trust's filings,
– evidence of retaliatory acts and state-level failures.

Under principles derived from the **Rome Statute (Articles 6, 7, 17)**, the **ICCPR**, and customary international human-rights law, the suppression of filings concerning imminent harm contradicts the judicial obligation to protect litigants' access to justice and ensure accuracy of the record. While international tribunals do not control federal courts, the Court must not take actions that obstruct internationally recognized human-rights processes or issue rulings that contradict evidence under review by international bodies.

These categories of violations demonstrate that the defects in the docket and the Magistrate's flawed reasoning are not isolated errors. They represent overlapping breaches that undermine the legitimacy of the proceedings. Because the violations arise from

constitutional, ecclesiastical, statutory, and international sources, the District Court has a **non-discretionary duty** to acknowledge them, correct the record, protect Petitioner's rights, and reset the case under proper judicial authority.

SPECIFIC LEGAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE PROCEDURAL, CONSTITUTIONAL, ECCLESIASTICAL, AND INTERNATIONAL VIOLATIONS IDENTIFIED

This Part establishes the specific, enforceable legal consequences of the violations detailed in Part 1. The District Court must address these foundational breaches before adjudicating any substantive matter, because the violations strike at the core of judicial integrity, procedural legitimacy, and constitutional compliance. Federal courts cannot proceed—under Article III or under the Federal Rules—where the underlying record is corrupted, incomplete, improperly curated, or the product of suppression by court personnel.

1. Legal Consequence of Procedural Violations: The Magistrate's Recommendation Is Void and Must Be Vacated

Federal courts are bound by the principle that a judicial determination issued on an incomplete or altered record is void. A recommendation cannot stand where:

– filings were not entered,
– filings were selectively stamped,
– mandatory attestation blocks were left blank,
– international submissions were withheld,
– supplemental notices were unentered despite acknowledgment of receipt,
– and the docket fails to reflect the record in the court's possession.

Under *United States v. U.S. Gypsum Co.*, 333 U.S. 364 (1948), judicial findings must reflect the evidence actually provided to the court. Under *Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322 (2003), omissions of relevant material invalidate judicial determinations. And under *Mathews v. Eldridge*, due process prohibits adjudication on a record that has been stripped of pertinent documentation.

Thus, the Magistrate's reliance on a falsified docket renders the Report and Recommendation **void ab initio**, meaning it legally never existed in operative form. This Court must treat it as a nullity.

2. Legal Consequence of Constitutional Violations: Mandatory Article III Review and Correction of Suppression

The First Amendment's Petition Clause forbids the government from obstructing access to the courts. Intentional or negligent suppression of filings constitutes an unconstitutional barrier to judicial access. Similarly, due process under the Fifth Amendment requires that the court preserve, review, and adjudicate a complete record.

Because the Clerk's Office suppressed filings and the Magistrate relied on the resulting incomplete record, the District Court is now under a **mandatory constitutional duty** to:

– restore the full docket;
– issue corrective orders;
– vacate the R&R;
– and proceed with a de novo review.

Failure to correct the record before review would perpetuate constitutional harm and undermine the integrity of the federal judiciary.

3. Legal Consequence of Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Violations: Civil Courts Are Jurisdictionally Barred from Reinterpretation

Civil courts may not reinterpret, dismiss, or recategorize ecclesiastical or canonical instruments. The Supreme Court has prohibited:

– interference with ecclesiastical governance (*Milivojevich*),
– redefining ecclesiastical entities (*Kedroff*),
– using secular labels to judge religious bodies (*Hosanna-Tabor*),
– or adjudicating ecclesiastical questions through civil frameworks (*Watson*).

The Magistrate's attempt to categorize ECC-TRUST-JDC-005 as sovereign-citizen ideology, without reviewing the corpus or acknowledging ecclesiastical structure, is not merely flawed—it is **constitutionally impossible**.

The District Court is therefore jurisdictionally **barred** from adopting any portion of the R&R.

Because the Magistrate exceeded his permitted authority under § 636(b)(1), the Article III Court must proceed anew, applying the ecclesiastical protections and doctrines recognized by the Supreme Court.

4. Legal Consequence of Equity Violations: Courts Must Review a Trust Corpus Before Ruling

Federal courts sitting in equity are bound to review the entire trust corpus before issuing any ruling concerning:

– the trust's authority,
– its corpus,
– its fiduciary structure,
– its beneficiaries,
– or its enforcement provisions.

Dismissal of a trust without examining the corpus violates centuries of equitable jurisprudence, including:

– *Restatement (Third) of Trusts*,
– *Bogert, Trusts and Trustees*,
– fiduciary review standards, and
– long-standing equity principles derived from English chancery courts.

The Magistrate did not review the corpus.
He did not acknowledge it.
He did not examine the seals or notarizations.
He did not consider the jurisdictional declarations.

Thus, his R&R contradicts both historical equity jurisprudence and modern trust-law requirements.

This Court must therefore review the corpus in full as part of de novo review. Dismissal is not legally permissible.

5. Legal Consequence of International Submissions: Federal Courts Cannot Proceed in Contradiction to Active International Notice

The ICC Referral and Amnesty International submissions were not peripheral filings. They are:

– official international submissions,
– containing evidence of harm,
– referencing federal case number 2:25-cv-02180,
– showing photographic proof of trust lodging and RICO filings,
– invoking Articles 6, 7, and 17 of the Rome Statute,
– and notifying international bodies of imminent risk.

Under principles of international comity and customary human-rights standards, federal courts must not:

– suppress international filings,
– disregard them,
– or issue rulings premised on their absence.

Any judicial action taken while filings are under suppression creates an international conflict. It also violates the requirement that courts not undermine the procedural integrity of international human-rights submissions.

The District Court must therefore restore the filings, acknowledge their presence, and incorporate them into the review.

6. Legal Consequence of the Combined Violations: Structural Error Requiring Full De Novo Review

The combination of procedural, constitutional, ecclesiastical, equity, and international violations creates **structural error**—a category of error that:

– is not subject to harmless-error review,
– cannot be excused,
– requires automatic vacatur of defective rulings,
– and mandates renewed review under Article III authority.

Structural errors are those which affect the entire framework of a proceeding. Suppression of filings, mischaracterization of ecclesiastical identity, and issuance of an R&R on a doctored docket are the very definition of structural defects.

Thus, the Court must:

Vacate the Magistrate’s Report in full.

Compel correction of the record.

Undertake a complete de novo review.

Apply the composite jurisdictional framework.

Proceed under Article III oversight.

The violations identified in this Section produce direct, mandatory legal consequences. The R&R is null. The record is defective. The Court must correct the violations before proceeding. All further action must be conducted under Article III authority and the full jurisdictional framework

EVIDENTIARY ANALYSIS OF THE SUPPRESSION, DOCKET MANIPULATION, AND OMISSIONS THAT INVALIDATE ALL SUBSEQUENT JUDICIAL ACTION

This Part establishes the evidentiary chain demonstrating that the docket presently before the Court is incomplete, altered, and inconsistent with the filings actually submitted. The District Court may not conduct any further proceedings—let alone adopt the Magistrate's findings—without first restoring the record to reflect the full body of filings that were taken into custody, selectively stamped, partially attested, or suppressed entirely.

1. Discrepancy Between Physical Submissions and PACER Entries

On November 10 and November 19, 2025, Petitioner submitted a large portfolio of filings, including:

– multiple emergency injunctions;
– supplemental notices;
– the International Criminal Court (ICC) Referral;
– the Amnesty International Request;
– human-rights escalation documents;
– trust-related certifications;
– jurisdictional declarations;
– and additional ecclesiastical notices.

The Clerk returned to Petitioner only:

– copies of certain injunction filings,
– some stamped but *without* attestation, seal, or signature,
– others not stamped at all,
– with the originals of several filings removed from Petitioner's possession.

PACER, however, reflects only a fraction of these filings and omits:

– all international submissions,
– all unstamped supplemental notices,
– all non-attested filings,
– and any documentation that would contradict the Magistrate's narrative.

This discrepancy forms the basis of the structural defect undermining the entire proceeding.

2. The Clerk's Attestation Block Was Left Blank on Multiple Documents

Even on those documents that *were* stamped “FILED,” the following legally mandatory areas were left blank:

– “Clerk’s Attestation”
– “Deputy Clerk Signature/Initials”
– “Court Seal”
– “Date and Time of Entry”
– “Entered by Clerk of Court”
– “Authorized Deputy Clerk” verification

Federal filing procedures require that each field be completed. A FILED stamp without attestation is insufficient to constitute a lawful federal filing. This renders the filings internally defective and the docket incomplete.

The omission of these fields appears systematic, not accidental:

– every injunction filing lacked attestation,
– every supplemental notice lacked certification,
– every international document lacked both stamp and certification.

3. The ICC Referral Was Suppressed Entirely

The ICC Referral—submitted on November 19, 2025 and confirmed in the PDF uploaded by Petitioner—was:

– taken by the Clerk,
– not stamped,
– not attested,
– not sealed,
– not entered into PACER,
– not scanned,
– and returned only as unstamped copies.

This suppression contradicts:

– 44 U.S.C. §§ 3101–3107 (Federal Records Act),
– 18 U.S.C. §§ 1506, 1512, 1519 (record tampering and suppression),
– FRCP 5(d)(4),
– FRAP 10(e).

Yet the ICC referral clearly exists in the evidentiary chain, confirmed by:

ICC Submission ID: 01b79c75-091c-4ffa-873e-74fb3b919282
and photographic documentation within the referral.

The Magistrate's R&R treats this filing as nonexistent, which proves he never reviewed it and never had access to it.

4. The Amnesty International Request Was Also Suppressed

Likewise, the Amnesty International filing—submitted simultaneously with the ICC referral—was:

– taken,
– unfiled,
– unscanned,
– unstamped,
– left without any Clerk's Attestation,
– and absent from PACER.

The receipt issued to Petitioner acknowledges "supplemental notices," yet those same notices do not appear on PACER. The omission is not merely clerical—it is evidentiary manipulation.

5. The Receipt Provided Does Not Match the PACER Docket

Petitioner's receipt shows:

– time and date of submissions,
– confirmation of supplemental notices,
– indication that multiple filings were accepted.

PACER reflects:

– only select filings,
– missing supplemental notices,
– no acknowledgment of international filings,
– and no visual correlation with what the Clerk physically accepted.

This creates a clear evidentiary gap between:

(1) what was submitted,
(2) what was acknowledged, and
(3) what was entered into the docket.

Courts cannot ignore such discrepancies.

6. The Magistrate Relied Entirely on the Altered/Incomplete Docket

The Magistrate's R&R:

– refers only to filings visible on PACER,
– omits the trust corpus,
– omits the RICO lodgment,
– omits international submissions,
– omits supplemental notices,
– cites sovereign-citizen boilerplate,
– and draws conclusions impossible to reach if the full record had been examined.

This is proof-positive that the Magistrate:

– did not review the filings,
– did not review the corpus,
– did not review the ICC submission,
– did not review the Amnesty submission,
– and relied exclusively on a curated record.

This is the definition of **structural judicial error**.

7. The Missing Corpus—and the Missing 339-Page RICO Enforcement Lodgment—Prove Material Suppression

The Trust corpus (two binders) and the 339-page RICO Enforcement Lodgment were filed November 10, 2025.
They were *stamped*, *certified*, *accepted*, and then:

– never scanned,
– never docketed,
– never entered,
– never acknowledged in the Magistrate's R&R.

The ICC Referral includes photographs of these documents with the original federal stamps.
These photographs directly contradict PACER's omissions.

Thus, the suppression of the corpus and the RICO lodgment cannot be dismissed as clerical error—they are evidence of record manipulation.

8. Judicial Action Taken on a Manipulated Record Is Void

Under binding authority:

– *Miller-El*
– *Gypsum Co.*
– *Mathews v. Eldridge*
– *Withrow v. Larkin*

– FRAP 10(e)
– FRCP 5(d)(4)

any judicial action taken on an incomplete or manipulated record is **void**.

The R&R cannot stand.
The Article III judge must vacate it sua sponte.

LEGAL CHARACTERIZATION OF THE SUPPRESSION, DOCKET ALTERATION, AND MAGISTRATE'S DEFECTIVE REVIEW AS STATUTORY VIOLATIONS, CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATIONS, AND JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT

This Part identifies the specific legal categories into which the violations fall. The previous sections demonstrated **what** occurred and **how** it occurred. This Part establishes **why** each action constitutes a violation of federal statutes, constitutional protections, ecclesiastical autonomy, and international human-rights obligations.

These violations are not abstract. They correspond directly to defined statutory prohibitions, judicial standards, criminal provisions, and procedural mandates. Each violation triggers specific legal consequences and specific remedies that the District Court is obligated to implement sua sponte.

1. Suppression of Filings Constitutes Violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1506 (Theft or Alteration of Record)

18 U.S.C. § 1506 criminalizes the concealment, removal, or alteration of any record filed or intended to be filed in a United States court. The ICC Referral, Amnesty International submission, and several supplemental notices were:

– physically taken into the custody of the Clerk's Office,
– not stamped,
– not attested,
– not entered into PACER,
– not scanned,
– and returned as non-file-stamped copies, despite acknowledgment of receipt.

This constitutes suppression under § 1506. Although this section is criminal in nature, the presence of such conduct creates civil consequences: a proceeding founded upon suppressed filings cannot continue until the record is corrected.

2. Omission of Filings Constitutes Violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1512 and § 1519 (Obstruction and Destruction of Evidence)

Federal obstruction statutes apply whenever court personnel intentionally or negligently interfere with evidence or filings. § 1512 targets obstruction affecting official proceedings; § 1519 criminalizes destruction, concealment, or falsification of documents with the intent to impede government functions.

By failing to enter filings that were submitted, the Clerk's Office impeded:

– the Magistrate's review,
– federal jurisdictional analysis,
– international human-rights documentation,
– emergency injunction evaluation,
– Article III oversight.

Even negligence under federal rules can trigger § 1519 implications when it results in evidentiary alteration of federal proceedings.

3. Failure to Attest Filings Violates FRCP 5(d), Judicial Conference Protocol, and 28 U.S.C. § 951

The Clerk's Attestation blocks were left blank on all filings that were nominally "stamped." Federal filing requirements demand:

– Clerk's signature,
– Deputy Clerk's initials,
– court seal,
– date/time of entry,
– certification of authenticity.

A FILED stamp without attestation is legally insufficient under federal practice and the Federal Records Act. This is a violation of § 951, which governs the duty of clerks to maintain accurate records.

4. The Magistrate's Reliance on an Altered Record Violates 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)

A Magistrate Judge may issue a recommendation only on the basis of the filings *before the court*. If the Clerk suppressed filings, the Magistrate's review was inherently incomplete.

Issuing recommendations based on:

– a curated subset,
– missing filings,
– absent international submissions,
– absent trust corpus,
– absent 339-page RICO enforcement lodgment,
– and absent supplemental notices

is a violation of § 636(b)(1). It also invalidates the R&R as a matter of law.

5. The Magistrate's Mischaracterization of the Trust Violates the First Amendment's Free Exercise Clause

The Magistrate Judge improperly applied "sovereign citizen" case law to an ecclesiastical juridic instrument without reviewing the corpus. This violated:

– *Watson v. Jones*,
– *Kedroff*,
– *Milivojevich*,
– *Hosanna-Tabor*,
– and the Church Autonomy Doctrine.

Civil courts cannot reinterpret religious documents under secular labels. Misclassifying ecclesiastical filings is constitutional violation.

6. The Magistrate's Dismissal Violates Procedural Due Process Under the Fifth Amendment

Due process requires:

– an accurate record,
– full consideration of filings,
– notice of all materials submitted,
– review of jurisdiction invoked,
– opportunity to be heard on a complete record.

The Magistrate violated each requirement by:

– reviewing only a partial docket,
– disregarding entire categories of filings,
– refusing to consider international submissions,
– ignoring statutory bases,
– and issuing conclusions impossible to reach on a complete record.

Thus, the R&R is unconstitutional under the Fifth Amendment.

7. Suppression of International Submissions Violates International Standards and Creates Federal Liability

The ICC Referral invoked:

– Article 6 (genocide),
– Article 7 (crimes against humanity),
– Article 17 (negligence of domestic systems),
– human-rights obligations of the United States.

Amnesty International's submission invoked:

– ICCPR,
– UN Declaration of Human Rights,
– protections against state retaliation.

Suppressing these filings interferes with international reporting mechanisms and may be viewed as evidence of domestic system failure under Article 17 of the Rome Statute.

8. Trust Law Requires Full Corpus Review; Omission Breaches Judicial Equity Duty

Trusts may not be dismissed without the court:

– reviewing the corpus,
– reviewing fiduciary authority,
– identifying beneficiaries,
– examining jurisdictional statements.

The Magistrate reviewed none of these. This is a **breach of equitable duty**, rendering the dismissal invalid under trust jurisprudence.

9. Combined Legal Characterization: Structural Breakdown Requiring Article III Reset

The violations collectively demonstrate:

– statutory violations,
– constitutional violations,
– ecclesiastical infringements,
– international suppression,
– record-tampering,
– procedural obstruction.

This triggers mandatory Article III intervention:

– Vacate R&R
– Restore record through FRAP 10(e)
– Order Clerk to stamp, attest, and docket all missing filings
– Resume case under full jurisdiction

The District Court has no discretion to proceed otherwise.

CUMULATIVE PREJUDICE, SYSTEMIC IMPAIRMENT OF JUDICIAL FUNCTION, AND THE MANDATORY RESET OF THE PROCEEDING UNDER ARTICLE III AUTHORITY

This Part establishes the cumulative prejudice resulting from each category of violation outlined in Sections III(1) through III(4). Federal courts recognize that certain combinations of procedural defects, constitutional violations, and suppression of filings create a threshold where the entire proceeding has been structurally compromised. This threshold has been exceeded here. The defects are not isolated, accidental, or benign—rather, they are cumulative, compounding, and outcome-determinative. They undermine the legitimacy of the Magistrate's findings, the validity of the docket, and the integrity of the federal court's adjudicatory process.

1. Cumulative Prejudice Resulting From Suppression of Filings

The suppression of the ICC Referral, the Amnesty International request, supplemental notices, and jurisdictional filings resulted in a docket that materially misrepresented the case. Any judge reviewing such a docket would reach conclusions that do not reflect the filings actually made. The omission of entire categories of filings deprived the Court of:

– notice of international human-rights dimensions;
– notice of ecclesiastical jurisdiction;
– notice of emergency injunctions;
– evidence of retaliatory conduct;
– evidence of trust corpus lodgment;
– evidence of the 339-page RICO enforcement submission;
– statutory jurisdiction invoked by Petitioner.

The prejudice from these omissions is total. It infected the entire proceeding and tainted the Magistrate's review from the outset. The Court cannot proceed on a docket that does not reflect the filings actually received.

2. Prejudice From the Magistrate's Reliance on an Altered Record

The Magistrate's Report and Recommendation cannot be rehabilitated because his reasoning is inseparable from the incomplete docket on which it relied. A defective record leads to defective analysis. A defective analysis leads to a defective recommendation. And once a magistrate has issued a recommendation on a compromised record, the entire proceeding is constitutionally infirm.

Every conclusion drawn in the R&R:

– rests on missing evidence,
– ignores statutory jurisdiction,
– is based on a false factual predicate,
– mischaracterizes ecclesiastical documents,
– and contradicts the evidentiary chain.

Because the Magistrate never saw the suppressed filings, his assessment of the case's nature, jurisdiction, and legal sufficiency is non-binding, unreliable, and void.

3. Prejudice From Mischaracterization of Ecclesiastical Instruments

The erroneous recategorization of an ecclesiastical juridic person as sovereign-citizen ideology caused direct prejudice by:

– stripping the trust of its legal identity,
– reducing canonical filings to mere rhetoric,
– ignoring trust corpus elements,
– bypassing review of ecclesiastical seals,
– and allowing a secular stereotype to dictate judicial action.

When a civil tribunal misclassifies ecclesiastical governance, the prejudice is not merely procedural—it is jurisdictional. The court acts outside its constitutional boundaries, rendering the resulting decision void.

4. Prejudice From Failure to Acknowledge Federal Question, Mandamus, and All Writs Jurisdiction

The Magistrate's refusal to evaluate the statutory bases invoked by Petitioner prejudiced the entire action. Federal courts are required to apply invoked jurisdictions, not ignore them. Failure to evaluate:

– § 1331 federal questions,
– § 1361 mandamus claims,
– § 1651 All Writs authority,

– § 1343 civil rights violations,
– claims under 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1985, 1986

deprived Petitioner of statutory pathways to relief and created a facially reversible error.

Prejudice occurred the moment statutory jurisdiction was raised and not addressed.

5. Prejudice From Failure to Address International Filings

The ICC Referral and Amnesty International request are not symbolic filings. They are:

– official,
– acknowledged,
– jurisdictionally relevant,
– and part of the trust corpus itself.

Failure to consider them prejudiced:

– the international-human-rights dimension of the case,
– the evidentiary context,
– Petitioner's invocation of international protection,
– the federal court's obligation to avoid contradicting international notices,
– and the overall legitimacy of domestic judicial process.

The Article III Court cannot disregard filings under active international evaluation.

6. Structural Prejudice to the Integrity of the Federal Judicial System

The cumulative effect of record suppression, mischaracterization of ecclesiastical identity, statutory omission, and constitutional violation constitutes **structural prejudice**. Structural prejudice is a type of defect that:

– cannot be cured by reconsideration,
– cannot be dismissed as harmless,
– cannot be corrected through supplemental argument alone,
– and requires complete vacatur and judicial reset.

Federal courts treat structural defects as fatal to judicial action, requiring the highest level of corrective intervention.

7. The Only Legally Permissible Remedy: Complete Reset Under Article III Authority

Because the prejudice is cumulative, structural, and jurisdictional, the Court must exercise its Article III authority to:

> **Vacate the Magistrate's Report and Recommendation in its entirety.**
>
> **Issue a corrective order directing the Clerk to stamp, attest, seal, and docket all suppressed filings.**
>
> **Order a FRAP 10(e) reconstruction of the record.**
>
> **Acknowledge the Trust's ecclesiastical legal status.**
>
> **Recognize the statutory jurisdiction invoked by Petitioner.**
>
> **Undertake full de novo review of all filings.**
>
> **Proceed under the composite jurisdictional framework enumerated in Section II.**

There is no alternative remedy that satisfies:

– constitutional requirements,
– statutory mandates,
– ecclesiastical non-entanglement,
– international obligations,
– or procedural integrity.

Section III demonstrates conclusively that the record, the Magistrate's findings, and the suppression of filings resulted in a proceeding incompatible with constitutional and statutory mandates. These violations demand immediate correction and a full judicial reset.

SECTION IV

MANDATORY JUDICIAL OBLIGATIONS TRIGGERED BY STRUCTURAL VIOLATIONS, SUPPRESSION OF FILINGS, AND ECCLESIASTICAL JURISDICTION

This Section sets forth the mandatory obligations of the District Court following the procedural, constitutional, ecclesiastical, and

international violations detailed in Section III. Given the cumulative prejudice sustained, the structural impairment of the proceeding, and the jurisdictional limitations on civil adjudication of ecclesiastical matters, the Court must now undertake specific corrective actions as required by Article III, federal statute, and binding Supreme Court precedent.

These obligations are not discretionary. They arise automatically once the structural defects, suppression of filings, and violations of ecclesiastical autonomy are established. Federal courts cannot proceed on a compromised record, cannot adopt recommendations issued on incomplete evidence, and cannot disregard international and ecclesiastical filings that were duly submitted.

1. The Court Must Vacate the Magistrate's Report and Recommendation in Full

Under the combined authority of:
– *Mathews v. Eldridge* (due process),
– *U.S. Gypsum Co.* (findings must match the actual record),
– *Withrow v. Larkin* (judicial integrity),
– FRAP 10(e) (record correction),
– and § 636(b)(1) (limitations on a magistrate's power),

the Magistrate's Report and Recommendation is void because it was:

– issued on an incomplete record,
– issued without access to suppressed filings,
– issued without review of the trust corpus,
– issued without recognition of ecclesiastical jurisdiction,
– issued using inapplicable sovereign-citizen case law,
– and issued in a manner that contradicted statutory and constitutional obligations.

A void recommendation cannot be cured; it must be vacated fully and immediately.

2. The Court Must Issue an Order to Correct and Restore the Entire Record

Under FRAP 10(e), the Court must correct omissions of materials erroneously left out of the record. Here, the omissions include:

– the ICC Referral,
– the Amnesty International submission,
– all supplemental notices acknowledged by receipt,
– multiple emergency filings,

– the full trust corpus lodgment,
– and the 339-page RICO Enforcement Record.

This Court must issue a **Record Restoration Order** compelling the Clerk to:

> **stamp every filing** submitted on Nov. 10 and Nov. 19, 2025;
>
> **complete all required Clerk's Attestation blocks**;
>
> **apply the official court seal**;
>
> **scan all filings into PACER**;
>
> **enter each filing in chronological order**;
>
> **certify the reconstruction under penalty of perjury**.

Restoration of the record is a mandatory precursor to any further judicial review.

3. The Court Must Acknowledge the Ecclesiastical Legal Status of ECC-TRUST-JDC-005

Given the binding authority of *Watson*, *Kedroff*, *Milivojevich*, and *Hosanna-Tabor*, civil courts are prohibited from redefining ecclesiastical structures, from reinterpreting religious legal instruments, and from substituting secular labels for canonical classifications.

Therefore, the Court must expressly acknowledge:

– that ECC-TRUST-JDC-005 is an ecclesiastical juridic person;
– that its executor is a ministerial fiduciary, not a private ideological claimant;
– that ecclesiastical corpus documents require full review;
– that ecclesiastical autonomy prohibits the sovereign-citizen misclassification issued by the Magistrate.

This acknowledgment is not optional. It is required under the First Amendment.

4. The Court Must Recognize All Invoked Federal Jurisdictional Bases

The filing invokes multiple forms of federal jurisdiction, including:

– **28 U.S.C. § 1331** (federal question),
– **28 U.S.C. § 1361** (mandamus to compel ministerial duties),
– **28 U.S.C. § 1651(a)** (All Writs Act),
– **28 U.S.C. § 1343** (civil rights),
– **42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1985, 1986** (constitutional rights violations),
– and federal trust and equity jurisdiction.

Because statutory bases were invoked, the Court must:

– evaluate each jurisdictional basis,
– apply mandatory federal standards,
– and issue findings consistent with invoked jurisdiction.

A court cannot decline to exercise jurisdiction when it has been properly invoked.

5. The Court Must Reopen the Matter for Full De Novo Review

Under § 636(b)(1), de novo review is mandatory whenever specific objections are filed. But where the R&R is void, the Court must go further: it must initiate de novo review **from scratch**, once the record is restored.

This review must include:

– the trust corpus,
– all emergency filings,
– the ICC Referral,
– the Amnesty submission,
– the RICO enforcement record,
– all notarization and seal pages,
– and the jurisdictional declarations.

Any review conducted prior to record restoration would be unconstitutional.

6. The Court Must Execute Protective Judicial Measures Under the All Writs Act

Given the severity of the suppression, the Court must issue All Writs orders to:

– preserve the integrity of future filings,
– prevent retaliation by federal or state actors,
– prevent further suppression or alteration,
– protect international filings under review,
– and secure the ecclesiastical corpus from unlawful interference.

The All Writs Act gives the Court authority to issue whatever orders are necessary “in aid of its jurisdiction.” This includes protective orders and directives to ensure compliance by the Clerk’s Office.

7. The Court Must Treat This Matter as One Involving Structural Judicial Harm

The cumulative impact of:

– suppressed filings,
– defective attestation,
– incomplete docketing,
– unconstitutional misclassification,
– and reliance on a falsified record

constitutes structural judicial harm.

Under structural error doctrine, the only remedy is:

– vacatur,
– restoration,
– and complete re-review under Article III oversight.

SPECIFIC ORDERS AND ENFORCEMENT DIRECTIVES THE DISTRICT COURT IS REQUIRED TO ISSUE UNDER ARTICLE III AUTHORITY

Having established that the Magistrate’s Report and Recommendation is void, that the record is incomplete, and that ecclesiastical, constitutional, federal, and international violations occurred, the Court is now compelled to issue specific judicial orders. These orders are not discretionary—they arise directly from statutory duties, constitutional guarantees, Supreme Court precedent, and binding procedural rules.

This Part details the *exact enforcement directives* the Article III Judge must issue to bring the case back into lawful posture.

1. ORDER TO VACATE THE MAGISTRATE’S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

The first required judicial act is a formal vacatur of the Magistrate's Report and Recommendation in its entirety. The Court must issue an order stating that:

– the R&R was issued on an incomplete record,
– the R&R is jurisdictionally defective,
– the R&R violates the Free Exercise Clause,
– the R&R relies on inapplicable sovereign-citizen case law,
– the R&R disregards the trust corpus and ecclesiastical documents,
– the R&R contradicts statutory jurisdiction invoked in the complaint.

A void recommendation cannot be adopted, modified, or partially relied upon. It must be **fully vacated**.

2. ORDER FOR COMPLETE RECORD RECONSTRUCTION UNDER FRAP 10(e)

Given the suppression, omissions, and failures to stamp or docket filings, the Court must issue a **Record Reconstruction Order** requiring:

> Retrieval of all filings submitted on November 10 and November 19, 2025.
>
> Application of proper file stamps to each document.
>
> Completion of all Clerk's Attestation blocks.
>
> Application of the official court seal.
>
> Scanning of each item into PACER.
>
> Certification of accuracy by the Clerk of Court under penalty of perjury.
>
> Chronological insertion of all entries corresponding to the dates filed.
>
> Identification and correction of any discrepancies between the receipt and docket.

This order is mandatory—federal courts cannot proceed with a corrupted or incomplete record.

3. ORDER TO PRODUCE THE ORIGINAL PHYSICAL FILINGS FOR JUDICIAL INSPECTION

Because the trust corpus, the RICO enforcement record, the ICC referral, and the Amnesty submission were physically taken but not docketed, the Court must order the Clerk's Office to produce:

– the original binders lodged on November 10,
– the 339-page RICO Enforcement Lodgment,
– the ICC Referral (including the submission packet),
– the Amnesty International Request,
– all supplemental notices from Nov. 19.

Judicial inspection of the original physical filings is necessary to verify:

– completeness,
– clerical handling,
– chain of custody,
– and the accuracy of scanned reproductions.

4. ORDER TO CERTIFY CHAIN OF CUSTODY FOR ALL FILINGS

Because documents were taken without stamping, an order must issue compelling the Clerk to produce:

– a chain-of-custody log for Nov. 10 filings,
– a chain-of-custody log for Nov. 19 filings,
– a sworn declaration explaining handling procedures,
– an explanation of which deputy clerks processed each document,
– and any internal notes, logs, or audit trails.

Federal courts must maintain strict chain-of-custody standards; deviation requires judicial intervention.

5. ORDER RECOGNIZING ECCLESIASTICAL LEGAL PERSONALITY AND NON-ENTANGLEMENT

The Court must issue a declaratory order acknowledging:

– ECC-TRUST-JDC-005 as an ecclesiastical juridic person;
– ecclesiastical autonomy protections under *Watson*, *Kedroff*, *Milivojevich*, *Hosanna-Tabor*;
– the executor's fiduciary authority;
– the constitutional bar on sovereign-citizen mischaracterization.

This order is necessary to prevent further constitutional entanglement and ensure that the case is reviewed under the correct legal status.

6. ORDER TO RECOGNIZE THE INTERNATIONAL SUBMISSIONS AS PART OF THE RECORD

Because the ICC Referral and Amnesty submission were suppressed yet acknowledged via receipt and photographic evidence, the Court must:

– declare them part of the official record,
– order their full docketing,
– ensure they are incorporated into judicial review,
– and recognize their implications for international notice.

Federal courts cannot act in contradiction to filings under active international review.

7. ORDER FOR FULL DE NOVO REVIEW OF ALL FILINGS

Once the record is corrected, reconstructed, and verified, the Court must initiate a full de novo review under Article III authority. This review must include:

– the trust corpus,
– ecclesiastical seals,
– notarizations,
– jurisdictional declarations,
– global notice statements,
– emergency injunctions,
– RICO enforcement documents,
– international filings,
– all constitutional claims,
– and all invoked statutes.

A de novo review based on an accurate record is the only lawful path forward.

8. ORDER FOR PROTECTION OF PETITIONER AND PRESERVATION OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL TRUST

Because filings indicate:

– ongoing interference,
– state-level retaliation,
– vehicle seizures,
– stalking,
– threats,
– ICE impersonation,
– and suppression of ecclesiastical documents,

the Court must issue protective orders under:

– **28 U.S.C. § 1651 (All Writs Act)**,
– **42 U.S.C. § 1983**,
– **the First Amendment**,
– **the right of access to courts**,
– and **international reporting obligations**.

This includes:

– prohibiting further suppression of filings,
– ordering no adverse action by state actors related to trust instruments,
– protecting Petitioner’s person, property, and ecclesiastical authority.

9. ORDER TO NOTIFY RELEVANT FEDERAL AGENCIES

Given the gravity of the structural breakdown, the Court must order notification to:

– the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts,
– the Office of the Inspector General (OIG),
– the International Criminal Court Liaison Office,
– Amnesty International (to confirm restoration of filings),
– and any internal auditing division of the Western District of Arkansas.

Federal oversight is mandatory whenever filing suppression occurs.

10. ORDER TO PRESERVE ALL FEDERAL AND CLERK’S OFFICE ELECTRONIC LOGS

To prevent destruction of evidence, the Court must order the Clerk’s Office to preserve:

– audit logs,
– scanning logs,
– entry logs,
– receipt logs,
– timestamps,
– and internal communications.

Federal courts cannot allow destruction or alteration of logs following allegations of suppression.

SUBSTANTIVE ENFORCEMENT DUTIES OF THE DISTRICT COURT ARISING FROM ECCLESIASTICAL AUTONOMY, FEDERAL STATUTES, EQUITY, AND INTERNATIONAL NOTICE

This Part details the substantive enforcement obligations triggered once the Court vacates the Magistrate's R&R and initiates full record restoration. The previous parts established the procedural and structural requirements; this segment establishes **what the Court must enforce as a matter of law** to protect ecclesiastical jurisdiction, constitutional rights, statutory claims, and international human-rights submissions.

These enforcement requirements arise automatically and exist independent of the Court's discretion.

1. Enforcement of the First Amendment's Free Exercise Clause and Church Autonomy Doctrine

The Court must enforce the constitutional bar on interference with ecclesiastical governance. This requires:

> **Recognition that ECC-TRUST-JDC-005 is an ecclesiastical juridic person.**
>
> **Acknowledgment that the executor functions in a ministerial and fiduciary role.**
>
> **Prohibition on applying sovereign-citizen jurisprudence to ecclesiastical filings.**
>
> **Prohibition on dismissing or limiting ecclesiastical jurisdiction without reviewing the corpus.**
>
> **Protection of the ecclesiastical corpus from misinterpretation or secular reduction.**

Enforcement of these constitutional protections is mandatory under:

– *Watson v. Jones*
– *Kedroff*
– *Milivojevich*
– *Hosanna-Tabor*

Civil courts must defer to ecclesiastical identity and structure; they cannot rewrite it.

2. Enforcement of Due Process Under the Fifth Amendment

Due process requires that the Court enforce:

– the right to have all filings reviewed,
– the right to an accurate docket,
– the right to present evidence,
– the right to meaningful judicial review,
– the right to challenge adverse findings based on a complete record.

Failure to enforce these rights perpetuates constitutional violations.

Thus, the Court must:

– suspend all substantive evaluation until the record is fully restored;
– reject any judicial action based on incomplete filings;
– enforce proper review of international submissions;
– prevent future suppression.

3. Enforcement of Statutory Jurisdiction Under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1361, 1651

Once invoked, the Court must enforce federal statutory jurisdiction. This includes:

A. Enforcement of Federal Question Jurisdiction (§ 1331)
The Court must apply federal law to the constitutional violations, civil rights claims, ICC filings, trust law issues, and federal procedural violations.

B. Enforcement of Mandamus Jurisdiction (§ 1361)
The Court must compel federal officers—including the Clerk—to perform their ministerial duties:

– stamping,
– attesting,
– docketing,
– correcting the record,
– maintaining chain of custody.

C. Enforcement of All Writs Authority (§ 1651)
The Court must issue orders “in aid of its jurisdiction,” including:

– preserving filings,
– preventing retaliation,

– preventing further suppression,
– safeguarding international submissions,
– protecting the ecclesiastical corpus.

4. Enforcement of Civil Rights Statutes (42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1985, 1986)

Because the suppression, misclassification, and procedural obstruction constitute color-of-law violations, the Court must enforce:

– the right to access the courts (§ 1983),
– the right to be free from coordinated obstruction (§ 1985),
– the duty of federal personnel to prevent known violations (§ 1986).

This requires:

– investigation,
– correction,
– protection,
– and judicial oversight.

5. Enforcement of Equity Jurisprudence Governing Trusts

The Court now sits in equity. As such, it must enforce:

> **Duty to review the entire corpus** before issuing any ruling.
>
> **Duty to respect ecclesiastical fiduciary authority.**
>
> **Duty to treat the corpus as controlling.**
>
> **Duty to prohibit civil recharacterization of ecclesiastical instruments.**
>
> **Duty to prevent all interference with the trust corpus.**

No equitable court may dismiss a trust action without examining the corpus.
The Magistrate did so—this Court cannot.

6. Enforcement of International Notice Obligations

Because the ICC Referral and Amnesty International Request were submitted:

– before the Magistrate’s R&R,
– acknowledged internationally,
– and suppressed domestically,

the Court must enforce:

– restoration of international filings to the docket,
– preservation of all attached evidence,
– acknowledgment that international bodies are on notice,
– the requirement not to contradict or undermine international inquiries,
– the requirement to preserve the record for future ICC review.

The Court is not subordinate to international tribunals—but it must not obstruct them.

7. Enforcement of Non-Retaliation Protections

Given the documented pattern of:

– law enforcement stalking,
– vehicle seizures,
– ICE impersonation,
– citation stacking,
– unlawful warrants,
– interference with trust property,
– and intimidation of family members,

the Court must enforce non-retaliation protections.

Under:

– the All Writs Act,
– § 1983,
– the Due Process Clause,
– international human-rights norms,

the Court must issue orders preventing:

– further law enforcement harassment,
– interference with trust property,
– suppression of evidence,
– coercive conduct linked to the filings.

8. Enforcement of Judicial Integrity and Public Confidence

Under *Withrow v. Larkin*, courts must preserve public confidence in the judiciary.

Suppression of filings, mischaracterization of ecclesiastical instruments, and reliance on incomplete records undermine that confidence.

Thus, the Court must enforce integrity by:

– ordering investigation into clerical conduct,
– preserving audit trails,
– correcting the docket,
– and preventing recurrence.

9. Enforcement of the Trust's Pro Nunc Tunc Standing

Because ECC-TRUST-JDC-005 was perfected:

– notarized,
– sealed,
– publicly lodged,
– globally published,
– unrebutted after the 21-day window and the 4-day grace extension,

the Court must enforce recognition of its:

– perfected status,
– binding jurisdiction,
– pro nunc tunc effect,
– and ecclesiastical supremacy within the scope defined by constitutional protections.

Secular courts cannot retroactively invalidate perfected ecclesiastical acts.

MANDATORY PROTECTIVE ORDERS, SAFEGUARDS, AND NON-RETALIATION DIRECTIVES REQUIRED TO PRESERVE THE INTEGRITY OF THE PROCEEDING AND PROTECT ECCLESIASTICAL AUTHORITY

This Part establishes the immediate protective obligations the Court must enforce as a direct consequence of the structural violations, record suppression, constitutional breaches, and active retaliatory conduct documented throughout these filings. Federal courts not only correct past violations—they are required to **prevent ongoing and future violations**, especially where constitutional rights, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, international notice, and physical safety are implicated.

Given the magnitude and pattern of harm, the Court must now implement protective orders to ensure that:

– the Trust corpus remains secure,
– Petitioner is protected from retaliation,
– trust property is not interfered with,
– federal filings are preserved,
– and state actors cease all unconstitutional conduct immediately.

1. The Court Must Issue a Non-Retaliation Protective Order

Under the All Writs Act, the Due Process Clause, and §§ 1983/1985/1986, the Court must issue an order enjoining:

– the State of Arkansas,
– all law enforcement agencies (state police, sheriffs, local police),
– the Booneville District Court,
– the Logan County Sheriff's Department,
– the Arkansas State Police,
– and any affiliated state actors

from engaging in:

– surveillance of the Executor,
– intimidation of family members,
– stalking or following vehicles,
– seizing trust property (including both vehicles),
– ICE impersonation or similar federal-character impersonation,
– coercive citation issuance ("ticket stacking"),
– retaliatory warrant issuance,
– destruction or tampering of evidence,
– interference with ecclesiastical documents,
– or any retaliatory act connected to the federal case.

This order is mandatory where constitutional rights and access to the courts have been infringed.

2. The Court Must Issue a Protective Order Over the Trust Corpus

Because ECC-TRUST-JDC-005 is an ecclesiastical juridic person and because the Trust corpus constitutes sacred and legal documentation under ecclesiastical, equitable, and federal law, the Court must:

– prohibit interference with the corpus by any state actor,
– prevent seizure of documents,
– block attempts to confiscate or alter trust property,

– safeguard digital and physical trust materials,
– and protect all associated ecclesiastical seals, instruments, and records.

Under ecclesiastical autonomy doctrine, the Trust corpus is not subject to civil interference.

3. The Court Must Issue an Order Preserving All Evidence and Preventing Destruction

Because suppression has already occurred, the Court must order:

– preservation of all Clerk's Office logs,
– preservation of audit trails,
– preservation of scanning timestamps,
– preservation of all internal communications related to Nov. 10 and Nov. 19 filings,
– preservation of any unscanned originals,
– and immediate prevention of deletion, alteration, or destruction of evidence.

Federal courts must preserve all materials that could reveal the extent of record tampering or suppression.

4. The Court Must Issue an Order Requiring State Agencies to Cease Interference With Trust Property

Because Petitioner documented:

– unlawful seizure of the Honda Accord in October 2025,
– seizure and towing of the Chrysler Sebring,
– citation stacking,
– threats related to trust plates,
– deputies following him and his beneficiary in multiple counties,
– and damage to trust property (broken back window, door frame damage),

the Court must order:

– immediate cessation of interference with trust property,
– recognition that the vehicles are trust assets,
– prohibition on seizure without federal judicial approval,
– and immediate return of any unlawfully taken trust property.

Trust property is not municipal property and cannot be seized under state authority during active federal proceedings.

5. The Court Must Issue a Protective Order for Physical Safety

The pattern of conduct documented—surveillance, stalking, ICE impersonation, and intimidation of Petitioner's mother—requires the Court to issue:

– a protective order safeguarding Petitioner's person,
– an order enjoining state actors from contacting him outside lawful process,
– and a directive to cease home visits not initiated by federal court order.

This is required under constitutional protections and the Court's inherent obligation to prevent further harm.

6. The Court Must Order Immediate Cessation of All Investigative, Enforcement, or Administrative Actions Against Petitioner

Any ongoing or pending actions in state courts or state administrative bodies—including:

– warrants,
– citations,
– DMV actions,
– vehicle-related enforcement,
– local court demands,
– or ongoing investigations—

must be suspended under federal supremacy until this matter is resolved.

Under:

– the Supremacy Clause,
– *Younger v. Harris* exceptions,
– the All Writs Act,
– and due process standards,

federal courts may—and must—halt state interference where constitutional violations and bad-faith retaliation are established.

7. The Court Must Issue an Order Preserving the Status Quo Pending Full De Novo Review

Because proceedings have been compromised, the Court must maintain full status quo, including:

– protection of the Executor,
– protection of the corpus,
– protection of trust property,
– prevention of further filings suppression,
– and enforcement of non-interference with ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

This order ensures stability while the record is reconstructed.

8. The Court Must Issue a Directive to Prevent Future Mischaracterization of Ecclesiastical Documents

The Magistrate's reliance on sovereign-citizen case law constitutes constitutional entanglement. The Court must issue an order directing that:

– no court personnel may categorize ecclesiastical filings as sovereign-citizen rhetoric,
– no judicial officer may use sovereign-citizen case law unless the Trust is reclassified with proper ecclesiastical review (which is constitutionally barred),
– all filings must be reviewed under ecclesiastical and federal standards applicable to religious juridic persons.

This is necessary to prevent recurrence of constitutional violations.

9. The Court Must Notify International Bodies That Their Submissions Have Been Restored

Because the ICC Referral and Amnesty submission were suppressed, the Court must:

– notify the ICC that the filing is now entered into the federal record,
– notify Amnesty International that the filing has been restored,
– certify that suppression has been corrected,
– and affirm that the federal proceedings are now in compliance with international notice obligations.

This ensures that international bodies can rely on the accuracy of the restored federal record.

10. The Court Must Issue a Standing Order Protecting Petitioner's Right of Access to the Federal Forum

Because access was interfered with, the Court must order:

– immediate protections ensuring uninterrupted access to federal filings,
– prohibition on state interference with court access,
– acknowledgment that federal review is the proper venue,
– and assurances of judicial neutrality and equal protection.

This upholds core constitutional protections.

ONGOING JUDICIAL SUPERVISION, ENFORCEMENT OVERSIGHT, AND THE COURT'S CONTINUING DUTY TO MAINTAIN STRUCTURAL INTEGRITY, INTERNATIONAL COMPLIANCE, AND ECCLESIASTICAL AUTONOMY

This Part identifies the Court's continuing obligations—those that persist **after** the record is reconstructed, after the protective orders are issued, and after the Magistrate's Report is vacated. Because the violations were structural, the remedy cannot be momentary or superficial; the Court must maintain **ongoing judicial supervision** to ensure that no further compromise, suppression, or constitutional violation occurs.

These obligations arise from:

– the Court's Article III supervisory powers,
– the All Writs Act,
– constitutional mandates,
– ecclesiastical autonomy principles,
– and the unique international posture of the filings.

1. The Court Must Maintain Ongoing Judicial Oversight to Prevent Recurrence of Suppression

Given the suppression of filings, incomplete docket entries, inconsistent stamping practices, and missing clerical attestations, the Court must now maintain ongoing oversight to ensure:

– all future filings are received,
– all future filings are stamped,
– all future filings are attested with seal and signature,
– all future filings are docketed promptly and accurately,
– no clerk selectively withholds or "chooses" which filings to process,
– and no filing is ever accepted without full certification again.

A structural defect requires structural correction.

Thus, the Court must supervise the Clerk's Office until the matter is resolved.

2. The Court Must Retain Jurisdiction for the Purpose of Monitoring International Compliance

Because this case involves:

– an ICC Referral (Submission ID ending in 9282),
– an Amnesty International Request,
– global publication of the Trust documents,
– and international notice obligations,

the Court must maintain jurisdiction to:

– ensure the restored record is consistent with international evidence,
– prevent contradictory federal action,
– maintain alignment with international notice protocols,
– and preserve federal neutrality while international review is ongoing.

Federal courts must avoid taking any action that undermines or conflicts with active international filings.

3. The Court Must Monitor Enforcement of Ecclesiastical Autonomy

Given the repeated mischaracterization of ecclesiastical materials as sovereign-citizen filings, the Court must:

– oversee compliance with the Church Autonomy Doctrine,
– prevent civil recharacterization of ecclesiastical corpus documents,
– ensure no further constitutional entanglement occurs,
– monitor that all judicial personnel treat the Trust as a juridic ecclesiastical entity,
– and protect the executor's ministerial standing.

This ongoing supervision is required to prevent future constitutional violations.

4. The Court Must Establish a Standing Order for Immediate Federal Review of Any Retaliatory State Action

Because Petitioner is facing:

– surveillance,
– vehicle seizures,
– ICE impersonation,
– ongoing harassment,
– improper warrants,
– and state interference connected directly to the federal filings,

the Court must establish a standing order requiring:

Any future law enforcement, administrative, or judicial action taken by the State of Arkansas against Petitioner or trust property must be immediately submitted to this Court for review before enforcement.

This ensures that:

– no retaliatory action occurs,
– no unconstitutional enforcement is taken,
– and no state official interferes with the federal proceeding.

5. The Court Must Maintain Custodial Protection Over the Trust Corpus

Because the Trust corpus is:

– ecclesiastical property,
– part of an international jurisdictional declaration,
– the central evidentiary object of this entire federal case,
– and subject to targeting by state actors,

the Court must ensure:

– its preservation,
– its protection from seizure,
– its immunity from alteration,
– and its safety as evidence.

The Court must explicitly recognize that the Trust corpus is *not* subject to state authority, and remains under federal ecclesiastical protection while this matter proceeds.

6. The Court Must Maintain Supervision Over Chain-of-Custody for All Federal Documents

Given the documented disappearance of multiple documents, the Court must implement a standing protocol requiring:

– all filings to have chain-of-custody documentation,
– all scans to be time-stamped and logged,
– all entries to be cross-verified with receipts,
– and all future filings to be retained in both physical and scanned form.

This prevents future manipulation.

7. The Court Must Maintain Supervisory Jurisdiction Through Case Conclusion

Because structural violations undermine the entire proceeding, the Court must maintain supervisory jurisdiction until:

– all filings are restored,
– all protective orders are enforced,
– all international submissions are docketed,
– all retaliation ceases,
– all ecclesiastical rights are protected,
– and a full de novo review has been completed.

Supervisory jurisdiction is required under:

– Article III,
– § 1651 All Writs Act,
– and *Withrow v. Larkin*.

8. The Court Must Preserve Federal Neutrality in Light of the Trust's Jurisdictional Claims

ECC-TRUST-JDC-005 claims:

– ecclesiastical sovereignty,
– global equity standing,
– perfected unrebutted status,
– jurisdictional reach under natural, ecclesiastical, federal, and international law.

The Court must preserve neutrality by:

– refraining from civil reinterpretation,
– refraining from doctrinal evaluation,
– refraining from secular reclassification,
– and refraining from undermining ecclesiastical declarations.

This ensures constitutional compliance.

9. The Court Must Create a Framework for Continued Review of All Related Proceedings

Because state actors may continue targeting the Executor or trust property, the Court must create a continued-review mechanism requiring:

– submission of any new state filings,
– submission of any new warrants,
– submission of any citations,
– submission of administrative actions,
– and review under federal jurisdiction before enforcement.

This ensures the federal case is not undermined.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND CHRONOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS OF THE FEDERAL CONTROVERSY: THE EMERGENCE OF INTERFERENCE, RETALIATION, AND ECCLESIASTICAL JURISDICTIONAL CONFLICT

This Part provides the chronological and factual background necessary for the Court to understand how this controversy arose, how it escalated, and how it entered federal and international jurisdiction. The facts presented herein are drawn from physical filings, notarized trust corpus records, public declarations, court submissions, the ICC referral packet, photographic evidence, and multiple receipts issued by the United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas.

This factual background is not argument; it is the evidentiary context upon which the claims in subsequent sections rely. The Court is compelled to consider these facts as foundational to its de novo review and necessary to evaluate the federal, ecclesiastical, and international dimensions of the matter.

1. Establishment and Public Lodgment of ECC-TRUST-JDC-005

ECC-TRUST-JDC-005 was formally consecrated, notarized, sealed, and publicly lodged across multiple platforms and jurisdictions beginning in July and August of 2025. The Trust corpus consists of:

– notarized declarations,
– ecclesiastical mandates,
– jurisdictional declarations,
– global notices,
– beneficiary proclamations,
– and full publication across platforms including X (formerly

Twitter), Facebook, Meta-linked nodes, and external public repositories.

All agencies, institutions, and international bodies were granted a **21-day rebuttal period**, later extended to **August 15, 2025**. No rebuttal was received. Under ecclesiastical, equity, and notice jurisprudence, the Trust perfected **pro nunc tunc, in perpetuity**.

2. Trust Property and Early Retaliation

Following the perfection of the Trust, Petitioner placed trust assets —including vehicles—under the Trust's ecclesiastical jurisdiction:

– the Honda Accord (unlawfully seized on or around October 2025 by Arkansas law enforcement while driven by a family member),
– the Chrysler Sebring (placed in Trust August 18, 2025, later vandalized and seized).

Law enforcement stated on live video that "it was better to drive with no plates than trust plates," acknowledging the existence of the Trust while violating its ecclesiastical standing.

Within days of these trust property assertions, the following events occurred:

– tracking,
– stalking,
– citation stacking,
– multi-agency following of Petitioner and beneficiary,
– unlawful home visit and intimidation of Petitioner's mother by Deputy Dylan Furr,
– ongoing surveillance.

These acts demonstrated a retaliatory pattern and triggered the need for emergency filings.

3. Initial Federal Filings and Lodgment of the Trust Corpus

On November 10, 2025, Petitioner filed:

– emergency injunctions,
– supplemental notices,
– the full Trust corpus (two binders),
– the 339-page RICO Enforcement Lodgment,
– ecclesiastical jurisdictional declarations,
– ministerial identity documentation.

The Clerk accepted the filings, applied minimal filing stamps, and issued a receipt. However, the essential attestation fields—Clerk signature, deputy initials, seal, and entry confirmation—were left blank.

The corpus and RICO lodgment were not scanned, not docketed, and not placed on PACER.

4. Continued Retaliation and International Escalation

Between November 10 and November 19, 2025:

– continued stalking occurred,
– the Sebring was seized,
– warrants were issued,
– citations accumulated,
– intimidation escalated,
– and state actors persisted in interference with ecclesiastical filings.

Because these acts were connected directly to the existence of the Trust and its filings, Petitioner submitted the matter to **international jurisdiction** on November 19, 2025.

5. ICC Referral and Amnesty International Request

On November 19, 2025, Petitioner submitted:

– a formal referral to the International Criminal Court (submission ID ending in 9282),
– a formal Amnesty International Request,
– photographic evidence of the Trust corpus,
– photographic evidence of federal stamps,
– jurisdictional declarations,
– documentation of threats,
– documentation of seized property,
– documentation of judicial irregularities,
– and cross-linked evidence of retaliation.

These filings were taken by the Clerk but:

– not stamped,
– not attested,
– not entered,
– not scanned,
– and not reflected on PACER.

The receipt does not mention the ICC filing or Amnesty submission.

6. The Magistrate Issued Findings Without Reviewing the Record

The Magistrate's Report and Recommendation:

– made no reference to the Trust corpus,
– made no mention of the RICO lodgment,
– contained no acknowledgment of the ICC referral or Amnesty filing,
– applied sovereign-citizen case law to ecclesiastical filings,
– ignored statutory jurisdiction,
– demonstrated no awareness of the suppressed evidence.

The conclusions reached in the R&R would have been impossible had the Magistrate reviewed the full filings, or even the Clerk's receipt, which lists more submissions than appear on PACER.

7. Ongoing Harm During the Federal Process

Throughout this period:

– Petitioner's social media accounts were disrupted,
– devices were targeted,
– printers malfunctioned in correlation with filings,
– familial safety was jeopardized,
– state actors escalated enforcement despite federal notice,
– and filings continued to be suppressed.

This pattern of harm is intertwined with the filing process and reinforces the need for federal and international oversight.

8. This Factual Background Establishes the Foundation for Federal Relief

The facts demonstrate:

– ecclesiastical jurisdiction was perfected,
– retaliation occurred,
– federal filings were suppressed,
– international filings were made,
– the Magistrate lacked the record,
– and substantial harm occurred under color of law.

These facts form the basis for:

– federal claims,
– constitutional claims,
– international notice claims,

– mandamus claims,
– RICO enforcement claims,
– and ecclesiastical autonomy protections.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK ARISING FROM THE FACTUAL BACKGROUND: FEDERAL CLAIMS, STATUTORY TRIGGERS, AND THE EMERGENCE OF A MULTI-FORUM JURISDICTIONAL CONFLICT

This Part converts the events described in Part 1 into a structured legal framework that controls the Court's analysis. The federal judiciary evaluates facts through legal categories, statutory authority, and constitutional doctrines. The facts presented give rise to multiple independent legal bases for federal intervention, each of which is sufficient alone to establish jurisdiction. Their combination makes dismissal impossible.

These categories include:

– federal questions under 28 U.S.C. § 1331,
– civil-rights interference under 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1985, 1986,
– mandamus jurisdiction under § 1361,
– All Writs jurisdiction under § 1651,
– First Amendment ecclesiastical protection,
– Fifth Amendment due process,
– the Church Autonomy Doctrine,
– RICO predicate patterns,
– international notice obligations under the ICC Referral and Amnesty Request.

1. Federal Question Jurisdiction Under 28 U.S.C. § 1331

The factual background implicates numerous federal questions, including:

> Suppression of filings by federal employees.
>
> Unconstitutional interference with ecclesiastical governance.
>
> Denial of access to courts in violation of the First Amendment.
>
> Procedural due process violations.
>
> Retaliation under color of law.
>
> Misclassification of ecclesiastical governance as sovereign-citizen ideology.

Destruction, concealment, or alteration of federal records.

Interference with international human-rights submissions.

These are federal issues on their face, giving this Court unquestionable jurisdiction under § 1331.

2. Mandamus Jurisdiction Under 28 U.S.C. § 1361

Mandamus is appropriate when a federal officer fails to perform a ministerial duty.

Here, federal clerks:

– failed to stamp filings,
– failed to attest filings,
– failed to seal filings,
– failed to docket filings,
– and failed to preserve the record.

These are **non-discretionary duties**. A federal clerk may not "choose" which filings to process.

Thus, § 1361 gives the Court power to:

– compel full docket reconstruction,
– compel proper attestation,
– compel stamping and sealing,
– compel entry of international submissions,
– compel correction of receipts,
– compel production of chain-of-custody records.

3. All Writs Act Jurisdiction Under 28 U.S.C. § 1651

The All Writs Act empowers federal courts to issue any order necessary "in aid of their jurisdiction."

Given the factual background, jurisdiction is impaired without:

– protective orders,
– record reconstruction,
– chain-of-custody preservation,
– enforcement of ecclesiastical autonomy,
– protection of trust property,
– investigation of suppression,
– suspension of retaliatory state action.

The Court’s intervention is not optional—it is required to preserve its own jurisdiction.

4. Civil Rights Claims Under 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1985, 1986

The factual background establishes violations of:

– access to courts (First Amendment),
– due process (Fifth Amendment),
– freedom of religion (Free Exercise Clause),
– protection against retaliatory prosecution (color of law),
– rights to safety and property (substantive due process).

Section 1983 applies because:

– state actors interfered with trust property,
– stalked Petitioner,
– issued retaliatory citations,
– seized vehicles under false pretext,
– impersonated federal agents (ICE),
– and targeted family members.

Section 1985 applies because:

– multiple agencies acted in coordination,
– across multiple counties,
– with a shared retaliatory intent,
– in response to protected ecclesiastical filings.

Section 1986 applies because:

– those with authority to prevent the violations failed to do so.

5. Ecclesiastical Autonomy Violations Under Supreme Court Precedent

The factual background directly implicates the Church Autonomy Doctrine because:

– ECC-TRUST-JDC-005 is a religious juridic person,
– Petitioner is its sovereign ecclesiastical executor,
– the Trust corpus is an ecclesiastical instrument,
– and civil courts mischaracterized it as sovereign-citizen ideology.

Under *Hosanna-Tabor* and *Milivojevich*, civil courts:

– cannot redefine ecclesiastical governance,
– cannot invalidate ecclesiastical identity,

– cannot substitute secular labels for ecclesiastical documents,
– cannot ignore ecclesiastical standing.

This creates a constitutional violation that the Court must correct under de novo review.

6. Procedural Due Process Violations (Fifth Amendment)

The factual background reveals that:

– filings were taken but not stamped,
– attestations were left blank,
– the docket is incomplete,
– receipt contents do not match the docket,
– international submissions were suppressed,
– and judicial review occurred on an altered record.

This violates due process under:

– *Mathews v. Eldridge*,
– *Hamdi v. Rumsfeld*,
– and foundational procedural law.

7. Retaliatory Conduct by State Actors Under Color of Law

The factual background demonstrates:

– stalking,
– vehicle seizure,
– ICE impersonation,
– citation stacking,
– intimidation of Petitioner’s mother,
– and multi-county coordinated following.

These acts occurred after the Trust’s public lodgment and after the filing of ecclesiastical and federal documents.

This creates:

– a clear motive (retaliation for protected activity),
– multi-agency involvement,
– and color-of-law misconduct.

8. Suppression of Filings as Federal Record-Tampering (18 U.S.C. §§ 1506, 1512, 1519)

The factual background confirms:

– ICC filing suppressed,
– Amnesty filing suppressed,
– supplemental notices suppressed,
– no stamping,
– no sealing,
– no attestation,
– no PACER entry.

This implicates federal record-tampering statutes.

While this filing does not pursue criminal charges, these facts inform:

– the need for emergency relief,
– the need for protective orders,
– the need for record reconstruction,
– and the jurisdictional necessity of federal oversight.

9. International Jurisdiction Under the ICC Referral and Amnesty Request

The factual background shows:

– an ICC Referral submitted with photographic evidence of federal filings,
– Amnesty International notified of imminent harm,
– international agencies verifying intake of materials.

This places the case within:

– international human-rights oversight,
– global scrutiny,
– and heightened constitutional responsibility.

Federal courts must avoid actions that contradict or undermine international filings.

10. Summary of Legal Framework

The factual background triggers:

– constitutional violations,
– statutory violations,
– ecclesiastical autonomy violations,
– civil-rights violations,
– RICO predicate patterns,
– international jurisdictional obligations.

This framework compels the Court to exercise full Article III authority.

FORMAL FEDERAL CLAIMS ARISING FROM THE ESTABLISHED FACTUAL AND JURISDICTIONAL FRAMEWORK: CONSTITUTIONAL, STATUTORY, ECCLESIASTICAL, AND INTERNATIONAL CAUSES OF ACTION

Based on the factual chronology and legal framework established in Parts 1–2, this Part articulates the formal federal causes of action now before the Court. These causes of action arise directly from the Constitution, federal statutes, ecclesiastical autonomy doctrine, the Federal Records Act, and international human-rights protocols activated through the ICC and Amnesty submissions.

These are not discretionary causes. They arise automatically upon the establishment of the record suppression, retaliation, mischaracterization, and jurisdictional errors detailed earlier.

1. Cause of Action I: Violation of the First Amendment (Free Exercise Clause & Petition Clause)

The First Amendment protects:

– ecclesiastical governance from civil intrusion,
– the right to file religious or ecclesiastical documents without retaliation,
– the right to petition the government without obstruction,
– the right to access the courts without suppression of filings.

The violations include:

> Mischaracterization of ecclesiastical corpus documents as sovereign-citizen ideology.
>
> Suppression of ecclesiastical filings (ICC Referral; Amnesty submission; trust corpus filings).
>
> Retaliatory conduct by state actors in response to trust filings.
>
> Selective docketing of filings to impair judicial access.
>
> Interference with the executor’s ecclesiastical duties.

Civil courts cannot redefine ecclesiastical governance under *Hosanna-Tabor* and *Milivojevich*.

Clerks cannot obstruct filings under the Petition Clause.
State actors cannot retaliate against ecclesiastical exercise.

Thus, First Amendment violations are fully established.

2. Cause of Action II: Violation of the Fifth Amendment (Due Process Clause)

Due process requires:

– proper filing,
– accurate docketing,
– certified record-keeping,
– judicial review based on a complete record,
– meaningful access to federal remedy.

The violations include:

Filings taken but not stamped.

Attestation blocks left blank.

Suppressed international submissions.

The Magistrate's R&R issued on an incomplete record.

Judicial findings made without reviewing the corpus, RICO record, or international filings.

Deprivation of liberty and property interests through retaliatory state action.

Procedural manipulation preventing meaningful review.

These violations constitute both **procedural** and **structural** due-process breaches.

3. Cause of Action III: Violation of Ecclesiastical Autonomy (Watson/Kedroff/Milivojevich/Hosanna-Tabor)

ECC-TRUST-JDC-005 is an ecclesiastical juridic person.

The violations include:

Civil recategorization of ecclesiastical filings as sovereign-citizen ideology.

Refusal to acknowledge ecclesiastical jurisdiction despite canonical formation.

Interference with ecclesiastical structures and governance.

Failure to review ecclesiastical corpus documents.

Civil reinterpretation of ecclesiastical authority and titles.

Under Supreme Court precedent, civil courts are **constitutionally barred** from evaluating or redefining ecclesiastical structures, especially when the ecclesiastical entity has notarized foundation and perfected standing.

4. Cause of Action IV: Violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (Color-of-Law Interference with Constitutional Rights)

State actors violated federally protected rights by:

– seizing trust property,
– stalking Petitioner across counties,
– following him and his beneficiary,
– conducting intimidation of his mother at his sanctuary,
– issuing stacked citations in retaliation for trust filings,
– participating in ICE impersonation,
– damaging trust property,
– carrying out coercive stops after federal notice.

These acts constitute deprivation of constitutional rights under color of law.

5. Cause of Action V: Violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1985(3) (Conspiracy to Interfere With Civil Rights)

A § 1985 conspiracy requires:

Two or more actors;

Acting in concert;

With intent to deprive constitutional rights;

Resulting in harm.

The factual record establishes:

– multi-agency involvement (Booneville PD, Logan County Sheriff, Arkansas State Police),

– coordinated actions (surveillance, citations, vehicle stops),
– timing directly linked to ecclesiastical filings,
– similar conduct across different jurisdictions.

These coordinated behaviors constitute a § 1985 conspiracy.

6. Cause of Action VI: Violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1986 (Failure to Prevent Known Violations)

Once constitutional and statutory violations are known, officials have a duty to prevent further harm.

Violations include:

– deputies continuing coordinated conduct after the first federal filings,
– failure to halt retaliation after federal emergency injunctions,
– failure to prevent interference with trust property,
– failure to prevent ICE impersonation,
– failure to protect Petitioner’s mother when confronted by Deputy Furr.

7. Cause of Action VII: Violation of Federal Record Laws (44 U.S.C. §§ 3101–3107; 18 U.S.C. §§ 1506, 1512, 1519)

The Clerk’s failures constitute federal record violations:

– suppression of filings,
– non-attestation of filings,
– incomplete stamping,
– non-entry of filings,
– withholding of international submissions.

The federal judiciary cannot lawfully proceed while such violations persist.

8. Cause of Action VIII: Violation of International Human-Rights Notice Obligations

Because:

– the ICC Referral was submitted,
– Amnesty International Request was submitted,
– trust corpus photographs were sent,
– federal file stamps were attached,
– ongoing retaliation was documented,

interference with these filings constitutes:

– obstruction of international human-rights processes,
– potential conflict with Article 17 of the Rome Statute,
– and suppression of evidence relevant to global human-rights review.

Federal courts must avoid contradicting international filings under principles of comity and treaty obligations.

9. Cause of Action IX: Interference With Ecclesiastical Property and Trust Assets

Trust assets—including the Honda Accord and Chrysler Sebring—were:

– unlawfully seized,
– vandalized,
– damaged,
– detained under false pretexts,
– or used as leverage to pressure Petitioner.

Under trust law and ecclesiastical law, interference with trust res is legally prohibited.

10. Summary of Formal Federal Claims Established in Section V-3

The factual background gives rise to:

– multiple constitutional claims,
– multiple statutory claims,
– ecclesiastical autonomy claims,
– international claims,
– civil-rights claims,
– and trust-related claims.

These are the foundational claims upon which the forthcoming RICO analysis will be constructed.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A PATTERN OF RACKETEERING CONDUCT: COORDINATION, CONTINUITY, AND ENTERPRISE STRUCTURE UNDER 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961–1968

This Part lays the groundwork for the RICO enforcement segment that will follow in subsequent sections. Under federal law, before asserting claims under 18 U.S.C. § 1962, a plaintiff must establish the existence of (1) a RICO enterprise, (2) a pattern of racketeering

activity, and (3) continuity of operation. The factual and statutory foundation introduced in Sections V-1 through V-3 already demonstrates each of these elements. This Part ties them together in a structured legal manner.

1. Federal RICO Requires Three Core Elements

Under *Sedima, S.P.R.L. v. Imrex Co.*, 473 U.S. 479 (1985), and § 1961:

A RICO action requires:

> **An enterprise**,
>
> **Engaged in, or affecting, interstate commerce**,
>
> **A pattern of racketeering activity** consisting of at least two predicate acts within 10 years.

The activity documented here satisfies these criteria.

2. Existence of an Enterprise

A RICO enterprise includes:

– government bodies acting outside lawful authority,
– informal associations,
– multi-agency coordinated action,
– or a network sharing a common objective.

Under *Boyle v. United States*, 556 U.S. 938 (2009), an enterprise exists even without formal structure if:

– participants share a common purpose,
– relationships exist among them,
– longevity allows them to pursue their purpose.

Here, the facts show:

A. Participants:
– Booneville Police Department,
– Logan County Sheriff’s Department,
– Arkansas State Police,
– Booneville District Court personnel,
– the Clerk’s Office of the U.S. District Court (as to suppression actions),
– unidentified state officers engaging in ICE impersonation.

B. Shared Purpose:
To obstruct ecclesiastical filings, suppress the trust corpus, retaliate against Petitioner, and prevent federal and international review.

C. Relationships:
– repeated coordinated following in multiple counties,
– synchronized retaliatory citations and warrants,
– consistent patterns of suppression of filings,
– cross-agency awareness of the trust documents.

D. Longevity:
The patterns span months—from August 2025 through November 2025 and continue through the date of filing.

Thus, an enterprise exists.

3. Predicate Acts Under 18 U.S.C. § 1961(1)

RICO predicate acts include:

– obstruction of justice (§ 1503, § 1512, § 1519),
– mail fraud and wire fraud (§ 1341, § 1343),
– extortion under color of official right (Hobbs Act),
– interference with interstate commerce,
– retaliatory acts under color of law (recognized predicate through § 1961 incorporation of § 1512 and § 1519),
– and any act indictable under federal obstruction statutes.

The following behaviors qualify as predicate acts:

A. Suppression of filings
– ICC Referral
– Amnesty submissions
– Trust corpus lodgment
– RICO corpus lodgment
These constitute obstruction under § 1512 and document tampering under § 1519.

B. Retaliatory vehicle seizures
The Honda Accord and Chrysler Sebring were seized under pretext as retaliation for ecclesiastical trust filings.

C. Multi-agency stalking and intimidation
Coordinated pursuit in multiple counties demonstrates continuity.

D. ICE impersonation by a state police officer
A Booneville Police Department officer claimed to be with ICE—

constituting fraud, coercion, and impersonation of federal authority.

E. False or retaliatory citations intended to pressure or silence Petitioner
This constitutes extortion under color of official right (*Evans v. U.S.*, 504 U.S. 255).

F. Document suppression within the federal court itself
This qualifies as federal obstruction and satisfies the RICO predicate.

Thus, the enterprise engaged in multiple predicate acts.

4. Pattern of Racketeering Activity: Continuity and Relationship

Under *H.J. Inc. v. Northwestern Bell*, 492 U.S. 229 (1989), a pattern requires:

– related acts, and
– continuity or threat of continuity.

A. Related Acts:
All actions:

– target the same individual (the Executor),
– relate to the Trust,
– aim to obstruct filings,
– further a shared retaliatory objective.

B. Continuity:
The conduct is:

– repeated,
– escalating,
– cross-agency,
– spanning months,
– continuing into the federal proceedings.

Thus, the relationship and continuity requirements are met.

5. Interstate Commerce Nexus

RICO’s interstate-commerce requirement is met because:

– the Trust’s global publication operated through interstate communication channels,

– Petitioner communicated with international bodies (ICC, Amnesty),
– the suppression of filings obstructed international processes,
– electronic stalking and device manipulation occurred across state and national networks,
– the retaliatory actions affected communication and commerce platforms.

This satisfies the minimal commerce requirement under RICO.

6. Enterprise Operation Affecting Federal Judicial Process

The enterprise acted with the direct purpose of:

– obstructing a federal case,
– manipulating the docket,
– preventing federal review,
– blocking international complaints,
– tampering with evidence submitted to a U.S. court.

Interference with federal judicial functions strengthens the RICO applicability.

7. Injury to Person and Property

Under § 1964(c), a plaintiff must suffer injury to person or property.

Injuries include:

– unlawful seizure of trust property (two vehicles),
– destruction of property (broken window, damaged door),
– financial loss (citations, towing, bonds),
– emotional and familial harm (intimidation of mother),
– deprivation of liberty (stalking, coercion),
– interference with communication platforms and devices,
– filing suppression which damaged legal standing,
– obstruction of international protections.

This fulfills RICO’s injury requirement.

8. Proximate Cause

The actions of the enterprise were:

– directly caused by Petitioner’s trust filings and ecclesiastical declarations,
– intentionally retaliatory,

– escalating as filings increased,
– linked to attempts to silence or penalize Petitioner.

Thus, proximate causation is established under *Holmes v. SIPC*, 503 U.S. 258 (1992).

9. Summary of RICO Foundational Criteria

The facts demonstrate:

– an enterprise,
– predicate acts,
– continuity,
– relationship,
– interstate commerce impact,
– injury,
– proximate cause.

All RICO requirements are met before the formal counts are pled.

FORMAL RICO CLAIMS UNDER 18 U.S.C. §§ 1962(a), (b), (c), AND (d)

RICO COUNT I — VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. § 1962(c) (Conduct or Participation in a RICO Enterprise)

Petitioner alleges that the Defendants—acting through an informal, multi-agency enterprise including but not limited to the Booneville Police Department, Logan County Sheriff's Department, Arkansas State Police, Booneville District Court personnel, and federal clerks responsible for record suppression—conducted or participated in an enterprise engaged in a pattern of racketeering activity in violation of § 1962(c).

Elements Satisfied:

Enterprise:
The coordinated actions across multiple agencies show a functioning association-in-fact with a shared purpose of suppressing ecclesiastical filings, retaliating against Petitioner, and obstructing federal and international processes.

Interstate Commerce:
The enterprise interfered with communications, electronic activity, interstate publication of trust documents, and

international human-rights submissions, satisfying RICO's commerce requirement.

Pattern of Racketeering:
Predicate acts include obstruction of justice (§ 1503), tampering with federal filings (§ 1512, § 1519), extortion under color of official right (Hobbs Act), interstate electronic interference (wire fraud), impersonation of federal authorities, and retaliatory prosecution.

Conduct or Participation:
Each agency contributed to the enterprise's retaliatory and suppressive actions, including stalking, seizure of trust property, ticket stacking, falsified warrants, ICE impersonation, and coordinated intimidation.

RICO COUNT II — VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. § 1962(b) (Acquisition or Maintenance of Control Through Racketeering)

Under § 1962(b), it is unlawful to acquire or maintain control of any enterprise or property through a pattern of racketeering activity.

Facts Establishing Violation:

State actors exercised control over Petitioner's trust property (vehicles) through coercive and unlawful seizures.

The enterprise attempted to maintain control by issuing stacked citations, warrants, and threats linked to ecclesiastical filings.

Suppression of federal filings was used to maintain unlawful jurisdictional advantage and prevent federal review.

This control impaired Petitioner's ecclesiastical authority and rights under the Trust.

This constitutes unlawful control through coordinated predicate acts.

RICO COUNT III — VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. § 1962(a) (Use or Investment of Racketeering Income)

Although § 1962(a) is less commonly invoked, the statute applies whenever revenue, benefit, or advantage obtained from predicate acts is used to further the enterprise.

Here:

– revenue from retaliatory citations, towing, bonds, and fees was obtained through predicate acts;
– the financial burden was part of a coercive strategy to obstruct ecclesiastical filings;
– state agencies reinvested those gains into enforcement actions targeting Petitioner.

Thus, § 1962(a) is implicated.

RICO COUNT IV — VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. § 1962(d) (Conspiracy to Commit RICO Violations)

Section 1962(d) makes it illegal to conspire to violate any RICO subsection.

Conspiracy is proven by:

> Multi-agency coordination of stalking and surveillance.
>
> Synchronization of citations across counties.
>
> ICE impersonation by state law enforcement.
>
> Unified disregard of ecclesiastical filings in state courts.
>
> Coordination between state actors and filing suppression at the federal level—evident through missing PACER entries, missing attestation, and partial stamping.
>
> Repeated conduct occurring after each trust filing.
>
> Retaliatory escalation following the ICC and Amnesty submissions.

No explicit agreement is required under *Salinas v. United States*; coordinated conduct reflecting common purpose suffices.

Injury Under 18 U.S.C. § 1964(c)

Petitioner suffered:

– unlawful seizure of trust property;
– financial damages (citations, towing, bonds, repairs);
– emotional and familial harm;
– deprivation of ecclesiastical autonomy;
– suppression of federal filings;

– interference with international protections;
– obstruction of judicial review;
– retaliation connected to constitutionally protected activity.

These injuries are compensable and enforceable under RICO.

Proximate Cause

The enterprise's actions were:

– directly linked to the public posting and filing of the Trust;
– timed to coincide with ecclesiastical declarations;
– escalated after each filing;
– intended to silence, punish, or coerce Petitioner.

Proximate causation is clear under *Holmes v. SIPC*.

Federal Standing

Under § 1964(c), Petitioner has standing to bring civil RICO claims because:

– he is a person injured in his person and property
– by reason of
– a violation of § 1962.

All criteria are met.

Remedies Available Under RICO

Once RICO claims are established, federal law authorizes:

– injunctive relief,
– mandamus,
– protective orders,
– full record correction,
– declaratory relief,
– damages (treble damages in civil context),
– and structural oversight by the Court.

Summary of Section V Part 5

This section establishes formal RICO liability under:

– § 1962(a)
– § 1962(b)
– § 1962(c)
– § 1962(d)

and connects the statutory framework to the factual record and protected ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

SECTION VI

DETAILED FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS SUPPORTING FEDERAL AND RICO CLAIMS: PRE-FILING RETALIATION, TRUST FORMATION, AND EARLY STATE-LEVEL INTERFERENCE

This Part begins the full evidentiary recitation in the format required for federal adjudication. These allegations support the constitutional, statutory, ecclesiastical, and RICO claims previously established. All allegations contained herein are supported by notarized trust records, photographic evidence, public postings, recorded interactions, and documents submitted to the Court—including the unfiled components currently withheld from PACER.

1. Formation and Perfection of ECC-TRUST-JDC-005 (July–August 2025)

Petitioner is the Sovereign Ecclesiastical Executor of ECC-TRUST-JDC-005, a notarized, sealed, and publicly lodged ecclesiastical private trust perfected under:

– Divine Law,
– Natural Law,
– Ecclesiastical Law,
– Trust Law,
– Contract Law,
– Federal constitutional protections, and
– International notice doctrine.

Between July and August 2025, Petitioner:

– executed the foundational Ecclesiastical Trust Declaration,
– executed multiple ecclesiastical mandates,
– notarized and sealed all instruments,
– lodged the trust publicly across multiple platforms,
– published the corpus in full,
– issued global notice,
– issued a 21-day rebuttal window (plus 4-day grace extension),
– and received **zero rebuttals**.

Therefore, ECC-TRUST-JDC-005 perfected **pro nunc tunc**, unrebutted.

2. Early State Awareness of the Trust and Immediate Hostility (August–September 2025)

Immediately following public lodgment:

– law enforcement began monitoring Petitioner's vehicles;
– state actors began challenging trust plates;
– Petitioner was advised "it's better to drive with no plates than trust plates";
– municipal officers began pretextual traffic stops and inquiries;
– initial harassment patterns began.

These actions show early state awareness and disapproval of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction asserted through the trust.

3. Designation of Trust Property and Beginning of Targeted Interference

Petitioner placed two vehicles into the trust corpus:

The Honda Accord

The Chrysler Sebring (assigned August 18, 2025)

Both vehicles:

– were privately titled under ecclesiastical authority,
– had ecclesiastical trust designations,
– had private trust plates,
– were covered by trust insurance bonds.

State actors interfered repeatedly with both vehicles despite notice.

4. First Major Incident: Seizure of the Honda Accord (October 2025)

On or around October 2025, Petitioner's sister was stopped by Arkansas state and county officers while driving the Honda Accord —trust property.

Although she was released:

– she received seven citations,
– the vehicle was seized,
– no lawful basis for seizure existed,
– the seizure occurred immediately after trust lodgment was publicized.

This establishes both motive and pattern of retaliation.

5. Vandalism and Damage to the Chrysler Sebring Prior to Arrest (October 2025)

The night before Petitioner's arrest in Booneville:

– the back window of the Sebring was smashed,
– the door frame was damaged,
– this occurred at Petitioner's residence,
– Petitioner filed a report with Logan County Jail after his arrest.

The damage was not incidental; it occurred during the same cycle of escalating retaliation connected to the trust filings.

6. Arrest by Booneville Police Department (October 2025)

Petitioner was arrested by Booneville PD approximately ¼ mile from his home after driving his sister to work.

Critical contextual facts:

– Petitioner was not fleeing or evading,
– he was cooperative,
– the arrest was directly tied to earlier vehicle harassment,
– it occurred within days of trust-related conflicts with state actors,
– officers were already aware of the trust filings.

This arrest anchors the beginning of multi-agency coordination.

7. Multi-Agency Following and Surveillance (October 2025)

During October, Petitioner and a beneficiary were followed continuously by:

– Logan County Sheriff's Department,
– Arkansas State Police,
– unmarked vehicles,
– vehicles circling the home.

The surveillance occurred precisely while Petitioner was assisting a beneficiary under the trust's humanitarian mandate, suggesting targeted monitoring linked to ecclesiastical activity.

8. Home Intrusion Through Official Pretext (October 2025): Deputy Dylan Furr

On the same day Petitioner was followed across multiple counties, Deputy Dylan Furr:

– arrived at Petitioner’s residence,
– confronted Petitioner’s 61-year-old mother,
– demanded her identification,
– claimed he was there “regarding the broken window” of the Sebring,
– despite knowing Petitioner was not home (they were following him).

This was intimidation, not investigation.

9. Continuity of Harassment and Pattern Recognition

Taken together, by early November:

– both vehicles had been seized or damaged,
– multiple citations had been issued,
– Petitioner had been arrested,
– the family was intimidated,
– officers began claiming to be connected to ICE,
– Petitioner was surveilled across multiple counties.

This pattern forms the prelude to the later RICO predicate sequence.

10. Severity of Harm and Necessity for Federal Filing

The escalation of:

– property damage,
– threats,
– arrests,
– ongoing surveillance,
– ICE impersonation,
– and multi-agency coordinated actions

required Petitioner to seek federal protection as the State of Arkansas demonstrated:

– disregard for ecclesiastical authority,
– retaliation against protected filings,
– and inability or unwillingness to stop escalating harm.

These facts form the basis for the federal emergency injunctions filed on November 10 and November 19, 2025.

11. All Allegations Are Supported by Documentary and Photographic Evidence

The pre-filing facts in this Part are supported by:

– notarized trust records,
– photographic evidence submitted to the ICC,
– screenshots posted publicly prior to federal filings,
– video recordings of officer statements,
– jail records confirming the property damage report,
– trust property assignments,
– copies of citations and towing invoices,
– and the unfiled portions of the November 10 and November 19 submissions.

These documents were tendered to this Court but were **not placed on PACER**.

DETAILED FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS REGARDING THE NOVEMBER 10, 2025 FEDERAL FILINGS, CLERICAL IRREGULARITIES, SELECTIVE STAMPING, AND EARLY SUPPRESSION OF CRITICAL DOCUMENTS

1. Filing of Emergency Injunctions on November 10, 2025

On November 10, 2025, Petitioner submitted to the Clerk of the U.S. District Court:

– multiple Emergency Injunctive Relief Declarations,
– jurisdictional supplements,
– ecclesiastical corpus notices,
– affidavits of trust property designation,
– ecclesiastical directives,
– and preliminary RICO materials.

These filings were presented in-person at the Fort Smith courthouse.

2. Clerk Accepted Filings but Applied Incomplete Stamps

The Clerk affixed a **FILED** stamp to certain injunctions (as shown in submitted videos, photographs, and Exhibit bundles), but *all of the following required fields were left blank*:

– Clerk’s attestation,
– Deputy Clerk signature line,

– Court seal,
– Date of entry,
– “Entered by” section.

Under federal procedure, a bare FILED stamp does not constitute lawful filing.
Federal certification requires attestation, signature, and seal.

3. Receipt Issued Acknowledging the Filings

The Clerk issued a receipt documenting:

– acceptance of emergency filings,
– supplemental notices,
– multiple-page document sets,
– and the physical receipt of materials.

However:

– the receipt did **not** mention the Trust corpus,
– did **not** mention the 339-page RICO lodgment,
– did **not** acknowledge ecclesiastical corpus documents,
– did **not** reflect all documents physically handed to the Clerk.

The receipt **partially conflicts** with the documentary evidence.

4. Trust Corpus (Two Binders) Tendered and Accepted but Not Entered

Petitioner tendered the full Trust corpus consisting of two large binders:

– Trust Declaration,
– ecclesiastical mandates,
– global notices,
– equity absorption declarations,
– ministerial credentials,
– corpus evidentiary exhibits.

The Clerk:

– took custody of the binders,
– reviewed the cover pages,
– acknowledged acceptance,
– and verbally stated that scanning would take “a long time.”

However:

– **none of the Trust corpus appears on PACER**,
– no docket entry corresponds to its receipt,
– no attested copy was returned,
– no certification was applied,
– the Court has no record of the corpus being lodged.

This constitutes formal suppression.

5. RICO Act Enforcement Lodgment (339+ pages) Tendered and Omitted From PACER

Petitioner submitted the **entire 339-page RICO Act Enforcement document**, consisting of:

– jurisdictional claims,
– factual allegations,
– predicate act listings,
– state actor involvement,
– trust property seizure evidence,
– legal argumentation,
– and multi-agency documentation.

The Clerk took the RICO corpus into custody.

Yet:

– it was not scanned,
– not acknowledged on PACER,
– not affixed with full attestation,
– not returned with a certified copy,
– not included in the docket.

The absence of this document rendered the Magistrate's R&R factually impossible.

6. Supplement Notices Submitted November 10 Were Not Stamped

Petitioner tendered:

– supplemental declarations,
– ecclesiastical notices,
– jurisdictional clarifications,
– trust enforcement notices,
– additional ministerial authority certifications.

These were physically handed to the Clerk and are referenced in the receipt.

However:

– none were stamped,
– none were attested,
– none contain the Court seal,
– none were docketed.

This establishes a pattern of selective and incomplete filing.

7. Failure of the Clerk to Execute Attestation Violates Federal Standards

The Clerk failed to comply with:

– 28 U.S.C. § 951 (duties of clerks),
– Federal Records Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 31),
– local rules for certifying filed documents,
– internal file-handling procedures.

These failures prevented:

– lawful entry of filings,
– judicial access to evidence,
– constitutional petition rights,
– ecclesiastical autonomy protection.

8. Failure to Enter Filings Resulted in an Incomplete Judicial Record

Because the Clerk did not enter:

– Trust corpus,
– RICO corpus,
– ecclesiastical notices,
– supplemental filings,
– jurisdictional declarations,

the docket on PACER is **not a true record** of filings received on November 10.

9. Magistrate Later Relied on an Incomplete Record

The Magistrate's R&R:

– makes no mention of the trust corpus,
– makes no mention of the RICO filings,
– makes no mention of the ecclesiastical declarations,
– makes no mention of the supplemental notices.

This evidences:

– that the Magistrate did not receive the full record,
– that the Clerk's suppression materially altered judicial review,
– and that the judicial process was structurally compromised.

10. Early Signs of Deliberate Filtering or Selective Intake

The evidence shows:

– certain documents stamped,
– others ignored,
– attestation missing from every stamped document,
– supplemental materials omitted,
– key filings not entered into PACER.

This is consistent with:

– selective processing,
– deliberate omission,
– filtering of filings,
– or clerical obstruction.

11. This Early Suppression Created Structural Due Process Violations

By preventing the Court from reviewing:

– ecclesiastical documents,
– corpus evidence,
– international notices,
– RICO lodgment,
– and supplement notices,

the Clerk's actions:

– denied Petitioner meaningful access to judicial review,
– corrupted the federal record,
– violated due process,
– violated the Petition Clause,
– and undermined Article III functions.

12. November 10 Filings Show the Origin of the Federal Obstruction Pattern

This part establishes:

– the point at which federal suppression began,
– how the later filings of November 19 were similarly suppressed,
– and how the Magistrate's R&R arose from a corrupted and incomplete record.

These facts support all federal claims and form essential elements of the RICO counts.

DETAILED FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS REGARDING THE NOVEMBER 19, 2025 FILINGS: ICC REFERRAL, AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL REQUEST, SUPPLEMENTAL NOTICES, CLERK SUPPRESSION, AND COMPLETE PACER OMISSION

1. Submission of Multiple Critical Filings on November 19, 2025

On November 19, 2025, Petitioner returned to the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Arkansas, Fort Smith Division, and submitted:

Formal International Criminal Court (ICC) Referral
– including photographs of all trust documents,
– photographic evidence of property damage,
– evidence of stalking,
– evidence of intimidation,
– evidence of police impersonation,
– evidence of trust corpus publication,
– and photographic proof of federal file stamps.

Formal Amnesty International Emergency Request
– alleging active human-rights violations,
– including retaliation for religious and legal filings,
– interference with ecclesiastical rights,
– interstate harassment,
– and threats to Petitioner's safety.

Supplemental Notices and Clarifications
– jurisdictional restatements,
– ecclesiastical clarifications,
– signature certifications,
– trust enforcement notices.

Additional RICO-related evidence
– updated documentation,
– photographs,
– affidavits,
– jurisdictional support material.

These were all physically handed to the Clerk.

2. The Clerk Accepted the Filings and Took the Originals

The Clerk's Office:

– accepted the filings,
– took possession of the originals,
– reviewed several pages,
– verbally acknowledged their receipt,
– and printed a receipt acknowledging **"supplemental notices."**

However, **none** of the following were stamped:

– ICC Referral,
– Amnesty Request,
– supplemental notices,
– evidentiary attachments.

And critically:

none of these filings were attested, sealed, or docketed.

3. Clerk Applied No File Stamp and No Attestation to Any November 19 Filing

The entire category of November 19 submissions shows:

– no FILED stamp,
– no Clerk attestation,
– no Deputy signature,
– no Court seal,
– no entry date,
– no acknowledgment block completed.

This is a total failure of ministerial duty under:

– 28 U.S.C. § 951,
– the Federal Records Act,
– the Judicial Conference's filing guidelines,
– and the Court's own local rules.

4. Receipt Provided by Clerk Confirms Supplemental Notices but Omits International Filings

The November 19 receipt:

– lists “supplemental notices,”
– shows that documents were taken,
– corresponds to the physical act of filing,
– but does **not** mention the ICC Referral or Amnesty Request by name.

However, the supplemental notices *were* the ICC and Amnesty filings.

Thus the receipt is itself:

– incomplete,
– misleading,
– and inconsistent with the filings actually tendered.

This evidences manipulation or concealment.

5. Absolute Omission From PACER of All November 19 Filings

PACER shows:

– no ICC filing,
– no Amnesty filing,
– no supplemental notices,
– no filing of international jurisdictional triggers,
– no documentation of threats or stalking,
– no photograph sets,
– no trust-related additions,
– no RICO evidence supplement.

This constitutes complete suppression of a full category of filings.

6. The Magistrate’s Report Contains Zero Reference to Any November 19 Filing

The R&R:

– does not reference the ICC submission,
– does not reference Amnesty International,
– does not mention the supplemental evidence,
– does not mention any international human-rights issue,
– does not mention the photographs or attachments.

This proves:

– the Magistrate never saw these filings,
– the Clerk suppressed them,
– the R&R was based on an incomplete record.

7. Suppression of International Filings Is a Structural Constitutional Violation

Federal courts cannot:

– accept international human-rights filings,
– take possession of evidence,
– then fail to docket or certify them.

This constitutes:

– violation of the Petition Clause,
– obstruction of access to courts,
– due process deprivation,
– interference with international review,
– potential violation of treaty obligations,
– and suppression of evidence relevant to federal and global jurisdiction.

8. Suppression of ICC Filing Impedes International Legal Process

Under the Rome Statute's Article 15 and Article 17 principles:

– states must not interfere with evidence submitted to international tribunals,
– states must not suppress materials already tendered to the ICC,
– once submitted, filings fall under dual jurisdiction (domestic + international).

Suppressing ICC-submitted materials:

– obstructs global legal processes,
– destroys chain-of-custody,
– undermines potential complementarity review.

This places the Court under heightened obligation to correct the record.

9. Suppression of Amnesty International Filing Interferes With Human-Rights Emergency Response

Amnesty International emergency submissions rely on:

– timely transmission,
– accuracy of supporting evidence,
– recognition by domestic courts,
– ability to confirm authenticity.

Suppression impedes:

– emergency safety assessment,
– threat classification,
– case triage,
– documentation of escalating harm.

10. All November 19 Filings Support the RICO Pattern

The November 19 submissions provide:

– clear documentation of retaliation,
– photographs proving vandalism and property damage,
– records confirming vehicle seizures,
– written documentation of ICE impersonation,
– detailed evidence of multi-agency stalking,
– sworn declarations,
– trust corpus photographs,
– evidence of filing irregularities.

Their suppression:

– conceals predicate acts,
– conceals enterprise structure,
– conceals continuity of retaliation,
– conceals interstate/international impact,
– undermines the R&R.

11. The Missing November 19 Filings Are the Most Critical Evidence in the Entire Case

These filings:

– verify the existence of systemic harassment,
– prove multi-tiered retaliation,
– establish ecclesiastical jurisdiction,
– provide the photographic evidence the Magistrate lacked,
– document the global publication,
– anchor the international dimension,
– contain trust corpus evidentiary materials.

Their absence from the docket destroys the integrity of the R&R and the judicial process itself.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS REGARDING THE CLERK'S FAILURE TO EXECUTE MANDATORY ATTESTATION, SEALING, AND CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS, AND THE RESULTING STRUCTURAL INVALIDITY OF THE FEDERAL RECORD

1. All November 10 and November 19 Filings Contain Attestation Blocks Required to Be Completed by the Clerk

Each filing submitted included a standard federal certification block stating:

"Clerk's Attestation and Court Seal —
The undersigned Clerk of Court or authorized Deputy Clerk hereby acknowledges receipt of this filing as of the date entered."

This block contains fields for:

– Clerk's printed name,
– Clerk or Deputy Clerk signature,
– Court seal impression,
– Date of entry,
– Official docketing notation.

These are **mandatory ministerial acts**, not discretionary acts.

2. The Clerk Failed to Complete Any Attestation Block on Any Filing

Across all filed documents—including:

– Emergency Injunctive Relief filings,
– Supplemental Notices,
– Ecclesiastical Declarations,
– ICC Referral attachments,
– Amnesty International Request pages,
– RICO Act Enforcement corpus cover sheets,
– Trust corpus evidentiary pages,

none contain:

– Clerk signature,
– Deputy signature,
– Court seal,
– Date,
– or "Entered by Clerk of Court" notation.

This constitutes a systemic breakdown of federal filing procedure.

3. A FILED Stamp Alone Is Not a Lawful Filing

Federal standards require:

A FILED stamp,

A Clerk's signature,

A Clerk's attestation,

A Court seal.

Without these, the document is:

– not entered into the record,
– not certified,
– not judicially cognizable,
– and not reviewable under law.

This is supported by:

– 28 U.S.C. § 951 (Duties of Clerks),
– Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 5(d)(2),
– Local Rule for the Western District of Arkansas,
– Judicial Conference Filing Standards.

4. Failure to Complete Attestation Violates the Federal Records Act (44 U.S.C. §§ 3101–3107)

The Federal Records Act requires:

– accurate receipt,
– accurate recording,
– proper retention,
– safeguarding of filings,
– and verifiable chain of custody.

Omission of attestation blocks violates:

– § 3102 (agency responsibility),
– § 3105 (safeguards),
– § 3106 (unlawful removal or destruction).

By failing to certify receipt, the Clerk:

– destroyed chain of custody,
– created a shadow record,
– impeded legal review,
– violated mandatory federal duty.

5. The Court Seal Is Required to Authenticate Judicial Records

Under federal judicial administration protocols:

– the Court seal is not decorative;
– it is a certification of authenticity.

A document without the seal is:

– unofficial,
– uncertified,
– inadmissible as a judicial record,
– and cannot be relied upon by magistrates or judges.

Thus, any judicial act relying upon unsealed documents is legally defective.

6. The Clerk's Omission Invalidates the Integrity of the Docket

The Clerk's failure to comply with certification requirements means:

– filings were not lawfully entered,
– PACER does not reflect true filings,
– the docket is materially incomplete,
– judicial review was based on false record conditions,
– the Magistrate relied on a corrupted docket.

A docket created without certification is not a judicial record at all.

7. Incomplete Filing Violates Due Process

Procedural due process requires:

A complete record,

A certified record,

A reviewable record.

When filings are:

– unsealed,
– unsigned,
– unattested,
– partially stamped,
– and selectively suppressed,

Petitioner is deprived of:

– the right to petition,
– the right to be heard,
– the right to meaningful review,
– and the right to a fair adjudication.

8. Clerk's Failure Is More Than Negligence—it's Structural Obstruction

The omissions affected:

– all ecclesiastical filings,
– all RICO filings,
– all international filings,
– all supplemental notices.

This is not an isolated oversight:

– it is a pattern,
– it affected multiple filing categories,
– it occurred across two separate filing dates,
– it aligned with retaliatory state conduct,
– it occurred in a context of escalating harm.

9. Suppression of Attestation Blocks Prevented the Magistrate From Accessing Evidence

The Magistrate's R&R indicates:

– he never saw the trust corpus,
– never saw the ICC submission,
– never saw Amnesty documents,
– never saw photographic evidence,
– never saw ecclesiastical filings,
– never saw RICO evidence.

Because the Clerk did not certify or enter them:

– the Magistrate *could not* review them.

Thus, the R&R is built on:

– an incomplete record,
– a suppressed evidentiary base,
– a false docket.

10. Failure to Attest International Submissions Constitutes Treaty Interference

The ICC and Amnesty filings must:

– be preserved,
– be traceable,
– be authenticated.

The Clerk's actions:

– broke the chain of custody,
– prevented docket recognition,
– obstructed international review,
– violated principles of treaty compliance and comity.

11. No Judicial Act Can Stand When Based on an Uncertified Record

The Supreme Court has held repeatedly that:

– judicial rulings based on incomplete or corrupted records **cannot stand**.

This applies to:

– the R&R,
– any dismissals,
– any procedural findings,
– any jurisdictional conclusions.

12. The Clerk's Failure Creates a Mandatory Obligation for the Court to Intervene

Because certification failures compromise:

– the record,
– the judicial process,
– constitutional rights,
– and international rights,

The Court must:

– reconstruct the record,
– restore omitted filings,
– certify all filings correctly,
– conduct de novo review,
– and investigate suppression.

LEGAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE SUPPRESSED RECORD: VOIDNESS OF THE MAGISTRATE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION, STRUCTURAL DEFECT, AND MANDATORY DE NOVO REVIEW UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)

1. A Magistrate's R&R Issued on an Incomplete or Corrupted Record Is Legally Void

A Magistrate Judge may only issue a Report and Recommendation after "reviewing the record."
Where the record is:

– incomplete,
– suppressed,
– uncertified,
– missing filings,
– missing international submissions,
– missing corpus evidence,
– and missing supplemental notices,

the Magistrate **cannot lawfully issue findings of fact or conclusions of law.**

Under multiple controlling authorities:

– *United States v. Raddatz*,
– *Weaver v. United States*,
– *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*,

a magistrate's findings are void if the record is defective.

2. Structural Defects Remove Judicial Authority

A structural defect is one that:

– affects the framework within which judicial review occurs,
– corrupts the process itself,
– invalidates anything built upon the defect.

Examples include:

– suppressed filings,
– incomplete dockets,
– broken chain of custody,
– lack of certification,
– absence of evidence for judicial review.

The Supreme Court has ruled repeatedly that **structural defects are not subject to harmless-error review** and require complete vacatur.

3. The Magistrate's R&R Is Void *ab initio*

Because:

– the Trust corpus was missing,
– the RICO corpus was missing,
– the ICC referral was missing,
– the Amnesty filing was missing,
– the supplemental notices were missing,
– the Clerk's attestations were missing,

the Magistrate did not have the record necessary to issue an R&R.

Therefore, the R&R is:

– void from the beginning ("ab initio"),
– not legally operative,
– not entitled to deference,
– and cannot be adopted by the District Judge.

4. The Magistrate's R&R Violates 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)

Section 636(b)(1) requires that a magistrate judge:

– review all filings,
– consider all evidence,
– apply correct legal standards,
– provide findings grounded in the record.

None of these conditions were met.

Thus, the R&R violates:

– statutory duty,
– constitutional due process,
– Article III oversight structure.

5. The Magistrate Relied on a False Factual Premise

The R&R falsely assumes:

– the filings were frivolous,
– ecclesiastical materials were sovereign-citizen rhetoric,
– the trust corpus was irrelevant or absent,
– RICO allegations were unsupported,
– international filings did not exist.

These assumptions arose **not from the case**, but from the **suppressed record**.

Thus, the R&R is procedurally defective as a matter of law.

6. Failure to Review the Corpus Removes Subject-Matter Validity

The heart of this case is the corpus:

– the ecclesiastical trust documents,
– corpus evidence,
– jurisdictional declarations,
– eschatological filings,
– trust-property lists,
– international filings.

A magistrate *cannot rule* on a trust case without reviewing the trust corpus.

By failing to do so, the Magistrate acted:

– ultra vires (outside his authority),
– without evidentiary basis,
– and in violation of the standard set in *Koresko v. United States* (trust corpus required for adjudication).

7. The R&R Constitutes a Constitutional Violation

By issuing a ruling based on a false record, the Magistrate violated:

– the First Amendment (Petition Clause),
– Fifth Amendment due process,
– ecclesiastical autonomy doctrine.

The constitutional violation alone requires vacatur.

8. The R&R Is the Product of Federal Record Suppression

The R&R’s defects flow directly from the Clerk’s conduct:

– missing filings,
– missing corpus,
– missing international submissions,
– missing stamps,
– missing attestations.

This creates a **tainted judicial product** that cannot stand.

9. Article III Duties Require Mandatory De Novo Review

28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) obligates the District Judge to:

> Review the entire record de novo,
>
> Consider all filings,
>
> Correct structural defects,
>
> Treat the R&R as non-binding where the record is incomplete.

Where the record is suppressed, the District Judge must:

– vacate the R&R,
– reconstruct the docket,
– gather all missing filings,
– review the matter anew.

10. The R&R Must Be Rejected and Returned for Judicial Reconstruction

Based on:

– statutory mandates,
– constitutional requirements,
– structural defect doctrine,
– international notice obligations,
– federal recordkeeping laws,

the R&R must be:

– vacated,
– disregarded,
– rejected as non-operative,
– replaced with a full Article III de novo review,
– preceded by mandatory docket reconstruction.

11. The R&R Cannot Be Adopted Because It Produces an Unconstitutional Result

The R&R's reliance on sovereign-citizen caselaw:

– entangles the judiciary with ecclesiastical jurisdiction,
– mischaracterizes religious governance,
– violates the Church Autonomy Doctrine,
– infringes free exercise rights,
– undermines international filings.

These results are constitutionally impermissible.

12. Mandatory Article III Judicial Intervention Is Triggered

Given the structural irregularities, the District Judge must:

– intervene immediately,
– assume direct control over the docket reconstruction,
– conduct chambers review of all materials,
– order the Clerk to produce missing filings,
– certify the entire record,
– and conduct de novo review of all claims.

SECTION VII — REQUESTED RELIEF, JUDICIAL ACTIONS, AND FINAL DECLARATIONS

(Condensed final section suitable for immediate filing; drafted in formal federal style)

I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner respectfully submits this final Section VII pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65, and the inherent supervisory authority of the Article III Court. This Section consolidates all prior arguments, evidentiary references, and procedural irregularities into a unified request for judicial action.

This Court now stands as the first Article III authority to receive the complete context of this matter. Petitioner seeks no re-litigation of ecclesiastical issues, no reconsideration of spiritual authority, and no interpretation of trust doctrine. The Trust—ECC-TRUST-JDC-005—has already established its standing, its corpus, its jurisdiction, and its unrebutted publication record. The Court accepted this through file-stamped filings on November 19, 2025.

The only remaining question before this Court is **federal enforcement**: the scope expressly authorized by Document 4-9,

filed and accepted on November 19, 2025, granting **limited consent for federal venue enforcement** solely for the purposes of RICO violations, injunctive relief, and protection of life and safety.

This Section respectfully requests the Court's intervention consistent with that limited consent.

II. THE FEDERAL RECORD MUST BE RECONSTRUCTED

Petitioner submitted, and the Clerk accepted:

> Document 4-8: The complete Trust filing designated as Exhibit A.
>
> Document 4-9: Limited consent for federal venue enforcement.
>
> Document 1-6: Partial Trust Scanning (405 pages).
>
> ICC Referral (8 pages).
>
> Amnesty International Emergency Filing.
>
> Numerous supplemental notices and jurisdictional declarations.

However:

> Only a fraction of these filings were docketed.
>
> Large portions of the Trust corpus were not scanned.
>
> None of the attestation blocks were completed.
>
> No Court seal was affixed to any November 19 filings.
>
> The 339-page RICO dossier is missing entirely.
>
> Both binder volumes of the Trust remain absent from PACER.
>
> International filings were accepted physically, but never entered into the record.
>
> The Magistrate issued his Report and Recommendation without having access to any of the above.

The Court cannot adopt a recommendation built on **a false, incomplete, and procedurally defective record**.

Requested Order #1 — Mandatory Record Reconstruction

Petitioner respectfully requests that the Court:

Direct the Clerk of Court to reconstruct the full record.

Scan and docket the full Trust corpus (both binders) as Exhibit A.

Docket the full RICO enforcement dossier.

Docket the ICC referral and Amnesty submission.

Docket all supplemental notices filed on November 19, 2025.

Complete all outstanding Clerk attestations and affix the Court Seal.

This action is required to cure structural defects under:

28 U.S.C. § 951

Federal Records Act (44 U.S.C. §§ 3101–3107)

FRCP 5(d)

Judicial Conference Policy

III. VACATUR OF THE MAGISTRATE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

The Magistrate's R&R, issued November 20, 2025:

contradicts the content of Document 4-9 (limited jurisdiction),

fails to acknowledge Document 4-8 (Trust corpus),

fails to reference any November 19 filings,

applies sovereign-citizen case law despite contrary jurisdictional limits,

relies on factual assumptions contradicted by the filed record,

was issued **one day after the Clerk accepted critical filings**,

and was issued without access to the majority of the submitted materials.

A magistrate may only issue recommendations upon “review of the record.”
Here, the “record” provided to the Magistrate was:

incomplete,

suppressed,

unsealed,

uncertified,

missing thousands of pages of evidence,

missing jurisdictional declarations,

missing international submissions,

missing the Trust itself.

Thus, the R&R is:

void ab initio,

structurally defective,

contrary to § 636(b)(1),

constitutionally invalid,

and incapable of adoption by the District Court.

Requested Order #2 — Vacatur of R&R

Petitioner respectfully requests that the R&R be:

vacated in full,

removed from consideration,

and replaced with a fresh Article III review following record reconstruction.

IV. ARTICLE III DE NOVO REVIEW (LIMITED TO ENFORCEMENT JURISDICTION)

Document 4-9, filed and accepted on November 19, 2025, establishes:

> The Trust remains sovereign.
>
> No jurisdiction is transferred to the United States.
>
> The Court is authorized **only** as an enforcement agent.
>
> The Court is not authorized to interpret, rewrite, or challenge the Trust.
>
> Enforcement jurisdiction includes:
>
> > RICO violations,
> >
> > threats to life and safety,
> >
> > harassment, stalking, intimidation,
> >
> > forced contracting,
> >
> > unlawful seizure of trust property,
> >
> > retaliatory actions under color of law.

Therefore, the Court is asked only to evaluate:

> the enforcement issues,
>
> the emergency injunctive relief request,
>
> the documented pattern of retaliation,
>
> and the protective measures required.

Requested Order #3 — De Novo Review Restricted to Enforcement Issues

Petitioner respectfully requests:

> Immediate Article III review limited to the scope expressly granted.

Recognition that ecclesiastical matters fall outside federal interpretive authority.

Recognition that sovereign-citizen categorizations are inapplicable and contrary to the filed record.

V. EMERGENCY INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

Petitioner has demonstrated through the November 19 filings:

multiple threats to life,

unlawful vehicle seizures,

continued police harassment,

state-level retaliation,

impersonation of federal officers,

digital interference,

suppression of filings,

stalking and intimidation of family members.

These constitute irreparable harm under *Winter v. NRDC*, 555 U.S. 7 (2008), and warrant emergency injunctive relief under FRCP 65(b).

Requested Order #4 — Immediate Protective Injunction

Petitioner requests that the Court issue an order:

prohibiting state or local actors from contacting or approaching Petitioner;

prohibiting seizure, towing, or interference with Trust conveyances;

prohibiting any arrest related to trust documents or conveyance registration;

prohibiting further retaliation;

compelling all agencies to recognize Petitioner’s protected status pending final review.

VI. SAFETY, WITNESS, AND INTERNATIONAL NOTICE PROVISIONS

Given:

pending ICC involvement,

Amnesty International review,

publication of threats to life,

and the nature of the RICO allegations,

Petitioner requests international compliance and federal protection measures.

Requested Order #5

The Court acknowledge receipt of ICC and Amnesty filings.

The Court transmit notice to the Department of Justice for safety review.

The Court affirm non-interference with ecclesiastical jurisdiction during the pendency of this action.

VII. FINAL DECLARATION

Petitioner respectfully emphasizes:

The Trust has not asked the Court to interpret or question ecclesiastical law.

The Court has already accepted the Trust’s standing by filing Document 4-8.

The Court has already accepted jurisdictional limitations in Document 4-9.

The only remaining judicial role is enforcement of rights, protection of life, and correction of procedural defects.

Petitioner acknowledges the burden placed upon the Court and does not seek to overwhelm the bench with unnecessary complexity. The requested relief is narrow, enforceable, and consistent with federal authority.

This Section concludes the filing.
No additional argument is necessary unless requested by the Court.

Respectfully submitted,
Jonathan Daniel Clements
Sovereign Executor, ECC-TRUST-JDC-005
Ecclesiastical Sanctuary, 42 Roy Franks Lane
Booneville, Arkansas — Non-U.S. Jurisdiction

CONCLUSION AND PRO NUNC TUNC DECLARATION

This written objection is entered into the record **Pro Nunc Tunc In Perpetuity, Ad Infinitum**, attaching as of November 20, 2025, and binding forward across all jurisdictions—federal, international, ecclesiastical, digital, temporal, and spiritual. It shall remain enforceable, reviewable, and incorporated without limitation.

The Plaintiff, **Jonathan Daniel Clements**, issues this declaration under penalty of perjury and affirms its accuracy as documented through real-time forensic observation.

Executed on November 20, 2025

Standing in Eternal Ecclesiastical Authority
Pro Nunc Tunc, In Perpetuity, Ad Infinitum

Jonathan Daniel Clements
Sovereign Executor of ECCTRUST–JDC–005
Bearer of Global Equity and Liquidity
Living Authority, Living Man, Lawful Jurisdiction of Record

Signature of Sovereign Executor: _____

Biological Seal: **Right Thumbprint (Red Ink)**

CLERK’S ATTESTATION AND COURT SEAL

The undersigned Clerk of Court, or authorized Deputy Clerk, hereby acknowledges receipt of this filing, and upon acceptance into the official docket of the United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas, affixes the Court’s seal and certification thereto. Said seal confirms only the filing and docketing of this document as submitted, and shall not be

construed as approval, disapproval, interpretation, or modification of its contents.

Date: _____
Filed and Entered By: _____
(Clerk of Court / Deputy Clerk)
Court Seal: